

THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN: THE BIBLE AND THE FATHERS

A PROFESSIONAL PROJECT

PRESENTED TO

the faculty of the School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Ministry

by

Jon Gifford Goman

June 1976

This professional project, completed by

Jon Gifford Goman,

*has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty
of the School of Theology at Claremont in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

Faculty Committee

Jane S. Douglass
Devin R. Wappler

May 6, 1976
Date

Joseph C. Hoyle, Jr.
Dean

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
I. INTRODUCTION TO BIBLICAL MATERIAL	5
II. THE CREATION OF THE WORLD AND THE FALL OF MANKIND	8
III. THE GENERAL NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE	23
IV. THE BIBLICAL EVIDENCE: SPECIFIC TEXTS	35
I Corinthians 11:2-16	35
I Corinthians 14:33b-36	54
Galatians 3:28	64
I Timothy 2:11-15	81
V. THE PATRISTIC EVIDENCE	95
Clement of Alexandria ca. 150-215	102
Didascalia Apostolorum ca. 200-250	107
Tertullian ca. 155-220	117
Origen ca. 185-253	125
Epiphanius of Salamis 315-403	131
John Chrysostom 344-407	135
Chrysostom and Olympia	144
Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzus	152
Excursus on Medieval Byzantine Canon Law	162
VI. THEOLOGICAL SPECULATIONS AND CAUTIONS	174
EPILOGUE	191
APPENDIX	I
BIBLIOGRAPHY	XXX

ABSTRACT

The Episcopal Church in the United States, as well as the Anglican Communion throughout the rest of the world, is at present trying to determine whether or not it should ordain women as liturgical priests. The arguments have been long and emotionally charged. For many, the issue cuts at the roots of Anglicanism by denying what is perceived to be a universal tradition of the church: that priestly orders may be conferred on men. Therefore appeals to history and church tradition have formed a very important part of this debate. Most of the appeals have seemed to me to be rather shallow and not based on as careful an examination of the evidence as the importance of the topic deserves. There is, basically, an assumption that there is a unified tradition against the ordination of women, and this assumption is shared by both the defenders and the opponents of the ordination of women. But the assumption has not been carefully examined, so far as I know. If this assumed tradition does exist, then the church needs to ask itself whether it retains, or indeed can retain, its validity for us. It is very important for the intellectual and spiritual integrity of the church, as well as for the correct solution of this particular problem, that we investigate to see whether the use of tradition as it has been used in this debate has been valid. That is one object of this project.

Besides, if the Anglican style is to retain its distinctiveness, it is important that we recognize how our present actions grow out of our Christian past. I believe that the emotional heat of the argument about the possibility of priesthood for women is obscuring how our present state grew out of our past. This project is also an attempt to think through in a more adequate way than has been done before what the relevant content of the past is as a prelude to dealing with the present arguments from a base of fact rather than emotion and fancy.

INTRODUCTION

The object of this study is to explore those parts of the Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Orthodox Christian tradition frequently appealed to in forbidding the ordination of women as liturgical priests. Therefore there are three broad divisions to the material covered: Biblical, patristic, and theological. The Biblical material includes the stories of creation and fall in Genesis 1-3, the Pauline material delimiting woman's place in the worshipping community (1 Cor. 11:2-16, 1 Cor. 14:33b-36, Galatians 3:28, 1 Timothy 2:11-15), as well as a more general introduction dealing with those Biblical arguments that cannot be tied down to a particular text. The section on patristic literature includes discussions of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, the Didascalia Apostolorum, Tertullian, Epiphanius of Salamis, John Chrysostom and Olympia, and the Cappadocian fathers, especially Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzen. This section is completed by a discussion of canon law in the Orthodox church and its application to the question of women's ordination. In the theological section I try to examine the present state of the question and draw some synthetic conclusions about the appropriateness of our use of tradition and the justice of ordaining women.

The criterion for selecting Biblical passages and figures for study is that they be commonly used in the discussion of the ordination of women. Thus this project may be called an intellectual history of the arguments against the ordination of women. I wish to discover if the traditional arguments may in any way be substantiated. Another objective is to discover if there may not be a current in Christian thought running counter to the accepted reasons for forbidding the ordination of women. Therefore the spotty coverage of this project does not prohibit one from drawing decisive conclusions from the material it presents. There may be inherent in the tradition positive but as-yet-undeveloped alternatives to the present practice by catholic churches of not ordaining women as priests. Conversely, if many of the arguments against the ordination of women prove fallacious, it becomes more and more questionable whether there is a valid tradition against it.

The price paid for trying to bring together all these divergent sources for authority is a rather diffuse study. Perhaps there may seem to be little connection between the different sections, except that all parts of the study are analysis and assessment of arguments that have formed part of the tradition against the priesting of women. The shape of this study is simply a reflection of the nature of the tradition against women priests: it is not a coherent or developed body of doctrine but an inchoate mass of feelings, arguments, theologies, and interpretations of the Bible that are quite unintegrated. ~~To somehow~~ present them as a unity is to create a synthesis not historically present.

Another factor contributing to the sense of diffuseness is that the project is full of loose ends. Time and time again I would come to a topic about which it would be appropriate to write at greater length, only to find that either the material was not physically available or that specialists' studies of the area had never been done. It is true that the story of women in the Christian church has been to a great extent hidden, and remains that way. For instance, we know very little about the actual modes of relationship between men and women in the early church in the areas of spirituality and worship. Why has so interesting and widespread a phenomenon as the Virgines Subintroductae received so little careful study? Why has the evidence of the writings of theologians (mostly men) been carefully studied while the evidence of art, church law, and Christian social history has been largely ignored? At the present state of the investigation of the history of women within the Christian church, a project like this is bound to have a certain "half-baked" quality about it.

Since the question of the ordination of women is now agitating the Episcopal church, the value of this study comes from the aid it could give in making church-policy decisions for well-thought-out reasons consistent with Anglican tradition. The danger is that my own strongly-held opinion in favor of the ordination of women will influence my presentation of the evidence. I recognize that this has happened, but I believe that the factual and logical evidence presented is capable of standing on its own. I am still convinced of my view if a valid argument against my present stance is given to me. So far, none has been. I recognize, however, that the pastoral and institutional

problems concerning the ordination of women may make it a painful occurrence for the church. But that set of problems is completely aside from whether we are bound to affirm or deny the possibility of ordaining women by the content of scripture, tradition, or theology. To confuse the two comes dangerously close to confusing God's will with our own.

I also intend this paper to be an example of Anglican theological method. For that reason an attempt has been made to bind together scripture, tradition, and reason into some kind of unity. It is the totality and balance of the evidence that is ultimately authoritative. Therefore, in this project one will find reason criticizing the content of scripture and tradition, and scripture and tradition providing the content with which reason works.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO BIBLICAL MATERIAL

In setting out to discuss the different aspects of the question of the ordination of women, I have tried to pay attention not only to the sort of evidence I personally would find convincing, but also to that which has been used in the church's discussion of the issue. For me, the individual verses of the Bible as isolated units are not ultimately conclusive, although the collective thrust of the Bible carries considerable weight. What is decisive is being firmly enough grounded in the tradition of Christianity that one can begin to live out of that tradition in a creative way. So the Bible gains its authority not as a code that compels obedience, but as a base from which one may begin to live out the moral and spiritual life implied in the Bible.

But in the history and present discussion of the question of the ordination of women, the question of individual texts is very important. Since this essay will be used in the debate now proceeding in the Episcopal church, it is important to deal with the elements of the argument that are actually being used. This means an examination of those Bible verses now being used in the debate to see precisely, if

we can, what they mean for the ordination of women. But mere historical knowledge of a text's meaning does not allow us to escape the necessity of deciding questions on their merit; the Episcopal church accepts the Bible as authoritative only as interpreted by the church, and such interpretations can and have changed. Interpretations by individuals, be they ever so famous, do not bind the church or its members, so we need to allow for the action of the Holy Spirit in this present time in changing our understanding and enlarging our vision. It is a question of trying to fit together concern with the authority of the Bible, the voice of the Spirit, the history of the church, human reason, and pastoral affairs. Therefore, a conclusion that scripture does allow us to ordain women does not mean it should be done, just as a negative conclusion would only be convincing if it were accompanied with a theological analysis showing how the ordination of women would interfere with the church's ability to worship God and offer His salvation. In other words, if the Bible says we may not ordain women we are not justified in saying no unless we discover what the adverse effects would be for our own time if such ordinations were actually performed. If we are not able to discover any, we may cautiously consider action.

So, remembering that what one can prove from the Bible depends both on the kind of presuppositions of its authority one takes to it, and also on the metaphysics one uses as a basis for interpretation, let us see what the Biblical material that has been used in the debate means, and whether we can construct some position from it about the ordination of women.

First, I will examine the Old Testament texts dealing with the creation of the world and the fall of mankind. Then comes an examination of the state of women in New Testament times and some of the traditional arguments against the priesting of women that depend on the Bible but do not refer to a specific text. After that will come a discussion of the single passages and texts most heavily used in the debate. With the exception of Galatians 3:28, these texts have been used since antiquity on the negative side of the debate. There is thus great continuity and tradition in their use that makes it all the more important to try and discover what the implications of these texts are in the light of modern study methods and understandings.

CHAPTER II

THE CREATION OF THE WORLD AND THE FALL OF MANKIND

The texts of Genesis dealing with the creation of woman and the part she plays in the fall of humanity are so rich that I cannot give anything like a full exegesis of them. But there are certain questions it is important to ask the texts if we wish to understand their position in this debate. These questions are: (1) Is the understanding of this text by the New Testament and the patristic authors something we can accept today, or were the prejudices of their own times read so heavily into their interpretation of the text that our honest attempts to understand the same texts must lead us to different conclusions as to the meaning of the original? If we are led to these different conclusions, how authoritative does the unacceptable exegesis by the New Testament or patristic author remain? The main New Testament texts used in this debate---1 Cor. 11:2-16, 1 Cor. 14:33b-36, 1 Timothy 2:11-12, Galatians 3:28---all refer in some way to the creation stories for their authority. In the eyes of those who wrote them, that authority would be removed if their exegesis of the Old Testament were incorrect. (2) Does the text have anything

to say to the question in itself and from our present perspective, aside from the historical interpretations of it? (3) Does the text in any way assume or justify male dominance or separate out specific tasks for the man and the woman that would make more appropriate the assumption of the formal priestly office by one or the other?

The text of Genesis 1:26-31 presents the position of man and woman as they were in the original intention of God. Genesis 1:31 states directly that the situation portrayed there is "very good." Well before St. Paul's statement that in Christ there is "neither male nor female" (Gal. 3:28) we find the priestly author asserting, "And God created man in his own image; in the divine image created He him, male and female created He them." (Genesis 1:27) The implication of this passage is that the complete personhood created in the image of God as Adam, the human race, is both male and female.¹

I think it is true that unless God possessed to the full both the male and female principle, which is not the same as sexuality, He could not fully make humanity to His image and likeness.²

According to Hunt, the Hebrew words used for male and female, zakar and n^equebah, (Genesis 1:27c) are strictly sexual terms; and images and likeness, selem and d^emuth, (Genesis 1:26) include the notion of a physical, corporeal similarity, thus accenting the fullness of the imagery.³ If this is true, then we find in the priestly account

1. Andre Dumas, "Similitude et Diversite des Sexes dans le Plan de Dieu," Etudes Theologiques Religieuses, XL:2 (1965), 99.

2. Joseph I. Hunt, "The Bible and the Status of Women - Equality, Subordination, Leadership" (paper presented to the conference of Anglican Theologians, Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, Ill, April 2-5, 1975), 4.

3. Ibid, p. 3.

the assertion that men and women share the divine image with each other in their very masculinity and femininity, but that neither fully possesses it alone.⁴ A structural analysis of this passage bears out this interpretation.

- I. The creation of man (Genesis 1:26-27)
 - A. God's declaration of intention (vs. 26)
 - 1. Man's intended relation to God (image and likeness) (vs. 26a)
 - 2. Man's intended relation to creation, all shall be subject to him (vs. 26b)
 - B. A report that God's declaration of intention was carried out (vs. 27)
 - 1. Man created in God's image. The word "Adam" used to emphasize the commonness of all human relation to God. (vs. 27a)
 - 2. Parallel to 1 above, emphasis on human unity (vs. 27b)
 - 3. Divine image in man as male and female, statement of diversity in the image (vs. 27c)
- II. The blessing of man (vs. 28)
 - A. God's blessing of man (Announcement in the form of a command?) (vs. 28)
 - 1. Be fruitful and increase (the human in relation to itself) (vs. 28a)
 - 2. Fill the earth and subdue it (the human in relation to the rest of creation) (vs. 28b)
 - a. Fish (sea)
 - b. Birds (air)
 - c. Living things that crawl (land)

That is, the dominion of mankind is to be over all living things in all three realms of creation, but the word "subdue" or "rule" is not used for the relation of one part of the image of God to the other.
 - B. The nature of the rule man exercises (vs. 29-31)
 - 1. The rule includes peace; the food for both man and the animals he rules is the green plant. (vs. 29-31)
 - 2. "It was very good." A statement that the picture we see here is God's intention and has his unqualified approval. (vs. 31a)

In Section I, B, 1,2,3, we see a three-fold statement emphasizing the importance of the human race being in God's image. The words "male and female" in 3 are an expansion of the word "man" or "Adam" in 1. The

4. Gerhard von Rad, Genesis, A Commentary (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972), 60.

word "Adam" is used throughout this passage in its generic sense;
 it means the completeness of humanity, the human race.⁵ The whole
 passage talks then of the relation of mankind to God. There is not
 the faintest hint that any part of the image and likeness can be
 confined to either the male or the female. (Cf. Genesis 5:1-3 where
 Elohim specifically names both the male and the female as "man".)
 The command to be fruitful and multiply (2, A, 1, above) obviously
 applies to both the male and the female. So the commands and the
 blessings of this passage apply to both man and woman.

Perhaps we see here a backhand reference to the fact that
 the God of Israel had no consort as the other near-Eastern gods did.
 I wonder if the emphasis placed on the fact that the one God contains
 the fullness of masculinity and femininity is not a slap at the
 pantheons of Israel's neighbors with their divine consorts and the
 assumption that the divided sexuality of human experience is a funda-
 mental characteristic of the world of the gods also.

Any exegesis of 1 Cor. 11:7 which interprets that verse to
 mean that only the male is fully in the image of God must contend with
 the fact that Genesis directly contradicts this. Paul has reached
 his conclusion from an exegesis assuming that the word "Adam" means
 the male. But as we have shown, the explicit reference to the female
 in Adam disallows this. The usage in both Genesis 1:27, the creation,
 male and female, in God's image, and the blessing in 1:28 show that

5. Ernest Lussief, "Adam in Genesis," Catholic Biblical Quarterly,
 XVII:2 (1956), 137-39.

the author of this passage conceived Adam in a generic, not an exclusively masculine sense.

When God instructs Adam to go forth and multiply and rule the earth, he is addressing both the masculine and the feminine. In the Bible this is the first time the question of authority comes up, and the authority to rule is placed on man and woman alike.⁶ The intention of Genesis is that in relation to the world, the male and the female share rule. This does not prove that God intended the two to be equal, but it certainly does cast doubt on the present acceptability of any opinion of the church fathers that the male is capable of exercising authority and the female is not. (See especially Chrysostom, p. 152.) The priestly author obviously does expect the woman to exercise authority; in fact, it is a divine command. There is nothing in this text to indicate that the male is expected to exercise any more authority than the woman, and nothing to show that her authority over creation is in any way different than his. The authority and responsibility of both parts of the image of God in relation both to God and to the rest of creation are stated in exactly the same way. There is no ground here for any statement that one can represent God better than the other.

Also, the authority God gives them is apparently not authority to punish and kill. In fact, Genesis 1:29-30 indicates that green plants were the only food and that the man and woman and all creation enjoyed a paradisiacal peace. I am not sure what sort of authority the text refers to, but it is important that it is not the usual sort of authority, that of imposing sanctions with the threat of the ultimate sanction, violence

6. Georges Casalis, "L'Homme et la Femme dans le Ministère de L'Église," Études Théologiques et Religieuses, XL:2 (1965), 34.

and death, always in the background. In the usual methods of justifying male dominance, man is said to possess the capacity to exercise authority because he is physically stronger, inherently more aggressive. But these capacities ultimately point to the power to force one's will on others with a threat of violence in the background. The priestly writer has rejected this sort of authority; the only authority that comports with mankind as the image of God is the authority of peace. Yet in patristic writing, and even today, male dominance is usually thought of along precisely the lines that the priestly author rejects.

To return to the three questions we proposed to ask these Genesis texts, there is obviously no justification of male dominance nor the assignment of special tasks to male or female in the priestly account. In fact, its tendency is to stress the mutuality and equality in a relationship with God that is alike in all fundamental ways: both are created in His image and likeness, both are blessed, both are given dominion over the three realms of creation, both are directed to community with each other in the command to be fruitful and multiply. If this text says anything, it is that women priests would not be unusual at all. In relation to the first question, the only New Testament passages important in this debate that use the priestly account are Galatians 3:28 and perhaps I Corinthians 11:7. I will show later that in the former Paul's use of Genesis is acceptable to the modern exegete. The reference to the priestly account in I Corinthians 11:7, where Paul has seemingly assumed that only the masculine is the image of God, is an incorrect exegesis, and we cannot hold both I Corinthians 11:7 and Genesis 1:27 to be true at the same time in a literalistic sense.

The J account is more difficult. The focal points of concern

here have traditionally been: 1. The apparent creation of 'man' before woman and her subsequent creation as if to satisfy a need of the male. 2. The making of woman out of man's rib, implying a sort of subordination. (I Timothy 2:13) 3. The naming of the woman by the man, again implying a subordination, especially in a culture where to be able to name is to exercise control. 4. The designation of the woman as the man's "helpmeet." These factors have been traditionally assumed to point toward a subordination of woman to man. But the text resists any such simple interpretation.

First, the creation of man before woman can hardly be interpreted as a sign of superiority since his situation is specifically called "not good" when he is alone. (Genesis 2:18) Until the creation of woman, man is not a being of superior capacity, but a rather pitiful figure looking at God's creation taking place before him and saying, "No, this one is not a companion fit for me; no, that one is not either." It is only with the creation of woman that man becomes complete. She is not an "extra" or an afterthought, but the capstone and completion of God's creative work. Her creation is contrasted with that of the animals which are made by God and then shown to Adam both to be named and in the hope of providing a companion fit for him. (Genesis 2:20) The animals, in contrast to the woman, cannot be a companion fit for him. It requires something of man's very self and nature to become that companion, and the woman is made from Adam's self, not from the ground as were Adam and the other animals. (Genesis 2:22)

The first common misuse of this text is to assume that because Adam was made first, he is therefore superior. Priority does not universally mean superiority in the old Testament. In the P account the

animals are created before Adam, and no one ever argues that that makes them superior. There is no evidence in the text itself that the creation of woman after man and out of him makes him superior. In fact, the point to the text seems to be the establishing of unity and community, not the creation of distinctions. (Genesis 2:24) This story explains why men and women become one flesh, not why they are different.

It is also possible to argue that since the first use of the words in the J account that denote masculine and feminine as sexual entities (ish and ishshah, Genesis 2:23) occurs only at the point where the man recognizes the woman as a fit companion, without woman man cannot really be called a sexual entity. Here also "Adam" probably means the completeness of all humanity, so that woman is created not out of masculinity, but out of mankind. Thus the J account asserts the unity and mutual necessity of man and woman. Any interpretation which sees the creation of a hierarchy as the point of this text is twisting the evidence.

In literary form, I believe the J account of creation is best understood as an extended chiasmus. The beginning of the creation of the known world is in Genesis 2:7, with the creation of Adam. The completion of the creation is man's recognition of his own completion by the woman in vs. 23. In between this creation of the fullness of humanity we find the creation of all other living things. The positions of importance, first and last, are given to humanity as a whole, with perhaps a slight emphasis on woman since it is her creation, and recognition by man as himself, as "bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh," that is the climax of the section. The text again stresses the appropriateness of the unity of male and female, and the necessity of their mutuality.

The chiasmus is the important literary element; mankind in their mutual-ity of recognition is supreme in creation. There is therefore no hint that the prior creation of the male (if that is what the text really says) is a cause of superiority. That is something we read back into the text from our general knowledge of ancient cultures. It may not apply here at all.

In fact, it has been cogently argued by Brueggemann that the formula "bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh" does not imply biological derivation at all, but is traditional language for denoting a covenant partnership.⁷ Thus the reason for J's saying that the woman is bone and flesh of the man is that the covenant partnership between the two is decisive for the identity of either one. Several other Biblical examples of precisely this language usage in the creation of covenants⁸ are cited.

Brueggemann believes the ish-ishshah sentence (Genesis 2:23b) to be an intrusion into the text, and gives the following reasons: 1. Nowhere previous to this verse is man called ish. If the woman is to be biologically derived from the male, ish should be mentioned previously, rather than ha 'adam. If the imagery of the story is to be carried out, the proper complement to ha 'adam in verses 21, 22, and 23 would be ha 'adamah. The rib is removed from ha 'adam, man in general, in verse 21, but woman is derived from specifically sexual man, ish, in verse 23. 2. If verse 23b is to make sense, it means that verse 23a would need to

7. Walter Brueggemann, "Of the Same Flesh and Bone," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXXII:4, 543-42.

8. See II Samuel 5:1, II Samuel 19:13-14, Genesis 29:14, Judges 9:2.

refer to biological derivation, but it does not. Therefore verse 23b is intruded.

To support this covenantal interpretation, Brueggemann points out that in verse 24 the words for "abandon" and "cleave to" both have a traditional usage in the description of covenants. The same is true of the words "one flesh," which have a traditional usage to denote a community of understanding and loyalty as much as any biological identification.⁹ Therefore it is very questionable if any hint of masculine superiority may be drawn from this text.

In the Yahwist history the word for "call" is quara. But to¹⁰ "call" and to "name" are not parallel usages. To acquire superiority or power over something the Yahwist has a special formula: "to call by name."¹¹ The lack of the full formula here, and the change in vocabulary may be of some importance. It is only after the fall that Adam calls his wife by the name Eve. (Genesis 3:20) Besides, ishshah is not a name, but a quality or a category. In Genesis 2:23b the man does not so much name the woman as describe her as his complement. At least there is no evidence in the Yahwist creation story that God's intent was for man to be superior to woman by his naming of her. Her subordinate position is announced only in Genesis 3:16 as a result of sin, and it is at that point that the man names her, not in the creation stories.

Finally, the designation of woman as "helpmeet" is simply an inadequate translation of the text. The word used for "helpmeet" is ezer.

9. Brueggemann, p. 540.

10. Phyllis Trible, "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation," Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XLI:1, 36.

11. See Genesis 4:17, 4:25, 4:26a.

It is used twenty-one times in the Old Testament, and sixteen of those times it refers to help coming from a superior source, especially help from God to the oppressed of Israel.¹² It is never clearly used to denote help from a subordinate, unless this one text is an exception, and it always refers to help of a beneficial kind that cements the relationship.¹³ The Hebrew word ezer really means "fitting," or "appropriate to the conditions," so there is no indication of any subordination here.

We need to remember that this is the only surviving account of the creation of woman in any ancient Near-Eastern literature. It is quite amazing that woman should hold such an exalted place in this account. The authors of the Genesis passages take their places among that group of people able to transcend the limitations of their own age, and imagine an ideal outside of their experience and different from the practice of their own time and place.

So the normative view of mankind for the Bible is one of cooperation and mutual responsibility between the sexes. The creation accounts aim toward mutuality and equality; there is not a hint of the inferiority of woman in any sense. But the authors of Genesis were aware that that did not describe the world they lived in. The fall is not merely a story about the origin of sin, but also of the tragic entrance of distrust and misunderstanding between the two sexes and the loss of that primeval unity of man and woman that was God's intention from the first. We must never forget that the roots of our tradition perceive the

12. See Psalms 33:20, Exodus 18:4, Psalms 146:5.

13. George Tavard, Women in Christian Tradition (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1973), p. 36.

subordination of woman as the result of human sin, not as the intention of God. Subordination of women is an evil we have forged for ourselves. At the end of the narrative of the fall we have moved from paradise to our present world, and the man and the woman of the fall are recognizable as our contemporaries. But the church can never afford to ignore the intention of God, and we become guilty of constricting the glory of His kingdom if in the middle of our partial solutions and compromises we do not constantly hold up the full ideal of the mutuality and equality, trust and cooperation expressed in the Genesis creation stories.

The story of the fall, especially Genesis 3:16, threatens this picture. It is from this verse that many have adduced their evidence for the subordination of women and therefore their unsuitability for the liturgical priesthood. I Timothy 2:14-15 asserts that the woman was deceived and Adam was not, and that she will be saved by living out the punishment God placed upon her in Genesis 3:16. Tertullian says¹⁴ the same thing. This is not, strictly speaking, what the text says. Neither the man nor the woman resisted temptation; both failed in their obedience. Each tries to shift the responsibility to someone else when they are discovered. (Genesis 3:12-13) The man is even more audacious than the woman here; he tries to shift the responsibility to God, who gave him the woman, while the woman merely tells the truth. The man does not come off better than the woman in the structure of the three-fold passage listing the punishments. (Genesis 3:14-19) The man had his place and received his doom alongside the woman. There is no hint of his moral supremacy. As Hunt says,

14. See the introduction to De Cultu Feminarum, p. 134 below.

To understand this text as a kind of divine ordinance indicating how women are to comport themselves for all times, as Paul seems to do in I Corinthians 14:34, is to misunderstand Genesis 3:16; but the text assuredly refers to factual subordination.¹⁵

There can be no doubt that Genesis 3:16 says, "your desire shall be for your husband and he shall rule over you." This dependence on and domination of woman by man represents a profound disturbance of the will of God; in the light of II Corinthians 5:16-21, to found our church structures on this disturbance is more than questionable. It is absolutely incorrect to see in Genesis 3:16 a reference to the orders of creation; the orders of creation have already been set in the creation stories, and Genesis 3:16 is a perversion of the order. To be faithful to the true order of creation we would try as much as possible to realize the vision of Genesis 1:27.

Moreover, this passage is seen by most exegetes as an account of why things are the way they are.¹⁶ To take an aetiological story and turn it into a legal principle is a serious critical mistake. To attempt to morally justify a state by its mechanical explanation borders on saying that because the state of affairs exists, it is right. Are we to understand all the statements pictured as made by God in Genesis 3:14-19 as binding for us? That would make it morally questionable to ease difficult births. We face a problem of consistency. If we accept the subordination of women as a divine law because of this passage, why do we not also accept as divine law the implications of the rest of the passage: that all men should be farmers (Genesis 3:17-19) and that

15. Hunt, p. 9.

16. Cuthbert A. Simpson, "The Book of Genesis, Introduction and Exegesis," in The Interpreter's Bible (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952), I, 510. See also Hunt, p. 8.

birth should be painful (Genesis 3:16). The problem of consistency has another side to it: if the subordination of women is accepted on the basis of this passage, it applies to all walks of life, not just to the question of whether women may become priests. There is no indication that this passage applies only in church affairs. It simply reflects a picture of the world which is dying as women create the reality of their own freedom and equality with men. Women do have authority over men in the modern world, and I have heard no advocate of the non-ordination of women propose that we return to universal subordination, which is what this text would logically require if it were to be used in the debate today.

Ultimately of more importance is the fact that both the man and the woman are described in relation to their primary work in ancient society. Man is identified with the soil and woman with birth. It is not the labor that is the result of sin, but the estrangement from the objects with which one labors, the separation. The punishment is not work or birth but that the world, the soil, the relation of man and woman to each other, and even the relation of the woman to her own body have become resistant, uncooperative, separated. In this way the basic punishment hits the man as hard as the woman; he too is excluded from the unity and peace of paradise in so far as she is excluded. They are still bone of each other's bone and flesh of each other's flesh. Their equality and mutuality is witnessed to even in their separate punishments, because these punishments basically show the ¹⁷terribleness of human life in its isolation and lonely pain.

To cling to the subjugation of woman since it is a result, according to Genesis, of the fall, is to deny the new life in Christ that

17. Tribble, p. 41.

has overcome the disobedience of Adam, and it is to value the form of our punishment more than that divine gift of grace with which Christ has lifted our fate and our punishment from us. Genesis 3:16 cannot be used as a reason for prohibiting the ordination of women.

CHAPTER III

THE GENERAL NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE

Two sorts of arguments against the ordination of women are commonly deduced from the Biblical evidence. One of these is based on the historical situations in the Old and New Testaments: priesthood in the Judeo-Christian tradition has always been reserved to men and Jesus chose only male apostles. The refusal to ordain women now is seen as obedience to that tradition.¹ The other sort of argument takes its stand on various specific New Testament texts, especially I Corinthians 14:33b-36, I Corinthians 11:2-16, and I Timothy 2:10-15. This version² of the argument sees these texts as authoritative for the church today. One approach relies primarily on the authority of a written text, the other on the authority of certain historical acts.

Both these approaches try to ground themselves in some kind of fundamental reality. This reality may be the very structures God created in the world at the beginning, where women are subordinate to men

1. Jean-Jacques von Allmen, "Is the Ordination of Women to the Pastoral Ministry Justifiable?" Verbum Caro, XVII:65 (1963), in H. Karl Lutge (ed.), Sexuality-Theology-Priesthood (San Gabriel: Concerned Fellow Episcopalians, n.d.), p. 24.

2. Ibid., p. 30.

and therefore are denied the priesthood because: 1. They are created from man. (I Corinthians 11:2-16 relying on Genesis 2:22 and 2:23b)
 2. Women sinned first so were punished by being made subordinate to men. (I Timothy 2:14-15) 3. They were created specifically to help men. (I Corinthians 11:9) 4. In the symbolism necessary to adequately represent in worship the nature of the new life in Christ, it is necessary for Christ to be represented by a man because Christ is the bridegroom
 3
 of the Church.

All this points to certain questions regarding the proper mode of interpreting the Bible that need to be settled before the relation between the Biblical witness and the question of the ordination of women can be discussed. We must first discover what the Biblical practices actually were and what the authors of Biblical documents actually thought was the will of God. Secondly, there is the question of how or whether to apply these practices and thoughts to the church today. How do we apply the Bible to the formation of church practice, remaining faithful to the revelation it contains but not making the Biblical documents at all points a rigid pattern for the church of our time? To make the Bible a rigid pattern for the church returns us to the arguments between
 4
 Richard Hooker and the Puritans. At least for Anglicans, the question is settled: we are not bound by the unexamined tradition. Reason and the present guidance of the Holy Spirit play a role which can be critical of tradition. I cannot hope to explore the philosophical dimensions of this question of proper method in Biblical interpretation, but I do

3. Ibid., pp. 34-35.

4. Richard Hooker, Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (New York: Dutton, 1907), I, Book III, Chapters 10.1 and 10.2.

need to give enough information to make my own position clear. A New Testament scholar's task is foremost to discover what a text meant in its own time, in its original setting. This requires an accurate knowledge of the ancient world. But to apply such a text to today requires just as accurate a knowledge of the modern world. That is something Biblical scholars are not necessarily more expert in than anyone else. Knowledge of ancient practice does not give the right to make decisions
⁵
 for today.

This matter of interpretation is important because the New Testament does not specifically consider the question of women as priests. It is not quite correct to say that the New Testament has forbidden women priests just because none were chosen as Apostles, or because Paul forbade women to speak in church assemblies. Any denial of priesthood for women on the basis of the New Testament evidence is necessarily an interpretation of texts to answer questions which the writers of the
⁶
 texts did not ask. To make the New Testament relevant to the question is a matter of interpretation. It is false to say that the New Testament directly rejects women priests; it never addresses the question directly, but only determines woman's equality in the Kingdom (Galatians 3:28), regulates her participation in community worship (various Pauline texts), and tries to define the nature of marriage (Ephesians 5:21).

When new questions arose in its corporate life, the New Testament church relied on the guidance of the Holy Spirit (Acts 15:78, I Corinthians 7:40) as well as on tradition. Whatever may be meant by reliance

5. Krister Stendahl, The Bible and the Role of Women (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 9.

6. Ibid., p. 40-41.

on the Spirit, it implies that the content of Biblical texts needs to be filled out; the general directions of God's movements in revelation of Himself need to be considered as well as specific texts. It also implies that God is still active with us today, and to imitate some received interpretation of the text is to worship the text rather than the living God. As Krister Stendahl puts it,

If the actual stage of implementation [of the new life in Christ] in the first century becomes the standard for what is authoritative, then those elements which point toward future implementation become neutralized and absorbed into a static "Biblical view"!⁷

What we are to do as Christians today is to discover and elaborate "those elements which point toward future implementation." We are to grow out of the New Testament, but to surpass its church life in faithfulness to the risen Lord and to complete the vision it glimpsed of what it is to be the people of God. The New Testament gives us tantalizing glimpses of what such a church might be like.⁸ To fulfill this vision requires the courage to follow that God who once before told His people He was going to do a new thing. It requires that we grow out of a tradition with the conscious recognition of where our roots come from, but at the same time it requires that we possess the freedom to do other than imitate our origin in a mythic or cyclical way as if history itself were not God's history.⁹

I will first deal with those arguments that see their roots in

7. Ibid., p. 35.

8. For instance, the realization of the unity implied in Galatians 3:28, the moral purity of Hebrews 13, and the ideal worship in the heavenly Jerusalem in Revelation.

9. Françoise Florentin-Smyth, "Ce que la Bible ne dit pas de la femme," Études théologiques et religieuses, II (1965), 76-77.

the historical actions of Jesus. One common form of this argument is that Jesus chose only male apostles who then became the first priests, and that Jesus was free enough from the social conventions of His time that He would have chosen women for priests if He had wanted them. This¹⁰ general form of the argument is very popular. It also has a hidden assumption which is never mentioned: that Jesus in His historical incarnation was omniscient.

There are three responses to this argument. One is to consider the effect in first-century culture of the choice of women as apostles. This is an historical and sociological question, and its answer depends on the cultural position of women in first-century Judaism. The other major response is to point out that it is by no means certain that the twelve were the first representatives of priestly orders; perhaps they were the origin of the whole church, including the laity. According to Luke-Acts, the main functions of the apostles were to witness to the resurrection and act as preachers, teachers and leaders of the community.¹¹ These are surely functions open to all Christians and not just to members of the ordained priesthood. As Hans Küng puts it, "who then are the followers of the apostles? . . . There can only be one basic answer: the Church. The whole church, not just a few individuals, is¹² the follower of the apostles." In relation to the world and each

10. Harold Riley, "Women as Priests?," p. 8; Louis C. Bouyer, "Some Remarks on Christian Priesthood and Women," p. 17-18; George Rutler, "Speech to the Convention of the Diocese of Pennsylvania," p. 57. All found in Lutge. The argument was used in ancient times. See F. X. Funk (ed.), Didascalia Apostolorum 3, 6 and also Epiphanius of Salamis, "Adversus Haereses," Patrologia Graecae XLII, c. 744.

11. Hans Küng, The Church (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), p. 353.

12. Ibid., p. 355.

other, all baptized Christians are authorized representatives of Christ, and the Anglican churches have certainly recognized the right of women to head the Christian community, both communities of women as abbesses¹³ and women deacons as rectors. It recognizes the right of women theologians to teach men, and it recognizes the right of women deacons to preach. Thus the functions of the apostles that Küng lists are being filled by women right now.

The third response is to ask what was meant by choosing twelve men as apostles. Most often, they are seen as representatives of the twelve tribes of Israel and are therefore the sign of the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecy of Israel's restoration in the new age. Such representatives according to Jewish law must be Jewish freemen. As the Old Testament patriarchs were men, so also their successors were¹⁴ men. In other words, Jesus's choice of male disciples was bound by the expectations of His own time. If He had chosen women disciples, the message He wished to communicate, that He was the fulfillment of prophecy, would not have been heard; its conditions would not have been met.

A variation of the argument that Jesus chose only men as apostles is that He was speaking only to men at the last supper when He said,

13. The Episcopal Church in America has a canon against deacons serving as rectors. This canon is not universal in the Anglican Communion, especially in missionary situations. One reason why it was so easy to introduce women priests into the Diocese of Hong Kong is that they had had women rectors who were deacons for several decades before they ordained women as priests.

14. M. E. Thrall, The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood: A Study of the Biblical Evidence (London: SCM, 1958), pp. 87-89. Also A. Dumas, "Biblical Anthropology and the Participation of Women in the Ministry of the Church," in Concerning the Ordination of Women (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1964), p. 34.

15

"Do this in remembrance of me." (I Corinthians 11:24) But this command of Christ's seems to be directed at the whole church, and to refer not merely to the consecration prayer but to the celebration by the entire community of His death, resurrection, and coming again. The Eucharist was instituted at the Last Supper, and according to Wahl the fact that there were no women present means that they cannot be priests. But this reasoning implies that since women did not receive that first communion they should not receive communion now. Christ performed the first Eucharist and the twelve received it, as must the members of the total Christian community, male and female, receive it now. Since most competent liturgists see the Eucharist as a corporate act of the whole community, it is more appropriate to see the Last Supper as the foundation of the total community rather than just one order in it. Thus it is questionable that any argument based on the fact that Jesus chose only male apostles is directly relevant to whether or not we can have women priests today.

To return to the first argument, there are several reasons why it would have been difficult for women apostles in Jesus's following to publicly preach, teach, and witness. Although it is dangerous to read back from the Talmud and other Rabbinic literature to the practices of first-century Judaism, some things about the position of women in that society are fairly certain.

First, women could not serve as witnesses in any case requiring
 16
 the agreement of two witnesses. This position was derived from

15. Joseph H. Wahl, The Exclusion of Women from Holy Orders (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1959), p. 12.

16. Herman L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, (Munchen: Beck, 1954), III, 217. See also Mishna Sotah 6.2.

Genesis 18:15: because Sarah laughed when the Lord promised Abraham a child, and then denied it, women were not permitted to witness. Not being acceptable as a witness was also one of the traditional nine punishments for woman's sin in Paradise.¹⁷

Obviously if Jewish society would not accept women as witnesses, it would not value their witness to the resurrection and the miracles of Jesus. Paul lends support to this attitude when in his list of resurrection appearances in I Corinthians 15:3 he fails to mention any women, although the Gospels claim that women were the first witnesses to the resurrected Lord. The Gospels themselves attach little value to the women's witness except to say, "these words seemed to them [the male disciples] an idle tale, and they did not believe them." (Luke 24:11) When the Gospels wish to make a theological point or hold up a decisive witness, it is the witness of men: of Thomas in John 20:24-29, of Peter in Luke 24:34 and I Corinthians 15:5, of Peter and the Beloved Disciple in John 21. The story of the women's witness is strangely incomplete, as if the authors of the Gospels did not quite know what to do with it. According to Mark (Mark 16:8) the women said nothing to anyone even after they were specifically instructed to do so; the long ending, Mark 16:11, says that the women told the disciples but were not believed. Matthew (Matthew 28:8) and Luke (Luke 24:9) claim the women told the disciples. Luke records the disciples' disbelief. In John 20:18 Mary Magdalene tells the disciples that Jesus has risen, but she seems not to have been believed because John 20:24 assumes it was the seeing of the Lord by the

17. Harry Thurston Peck (ed.), The Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities (New York: Harpers, 1897), p. 1011. Gives evidence that women were excluded from legal witness in classical cultures also. See articles "Athenian Law" and "Roman Law."

twelve that was the decisive witness. Only in Matthew is the women's witness allowed to stand without comment, and even there the important pericope seems to be Matthew 28:16-20, not 28:1-10. The church for Matthew is founded on the appearance to the disciples in Galilee, not on the appearance to the two Marys in Jerusalem. If the Christian Church was founded on witness to the risen Lord, the women's witness has remarkably little weight attached to it. What a society is prepared to hear can in some measure determine how much of the resurrection message it is prepared to live out. The early church was not ready to hear women as primary witnesses to the resurrection and so imposed its historical limits on the mode of formation of the Christian community. The lack of women apostles is easily explained as a cultural custom which it is permissible to change now that women do not suffer the same legal¹⁸ restrictions.

Another set of legal restrictions was relevant. Women were not¹⁹ permitted to study the Torah, an obvious reason why there were so few women teachers among the Jewish Christians, since none of them had the thorough knowledge of the scripture necessary to teach. And since most members of the church were adult converts, the chance for women to learn

18. There is one piece of evidence that women may have been apostles in the Pauline churches. Romans 16:7 mentions Andronicus and Junia as fellow apostles with Paul. The textual tradition of the name Junia is interesting; Chrysostom took it to be a woman (see Chrysostom, Homilies on Acts and Romans, in A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Series I, Vol. II, p. 555), but there is confusion over whether the name is actually masculine or feminine. See M. J. Lagrange, St. Paul Epître aux Romains (Paris: Gabalda, 1950), p. 366. He thinks the feminine reading the most probably.

19. Strack and Billerbeck, III, 157, 467-68. Albert Oepke, "ἡ γυναῖς," in Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), I, 787. Stendahl, p. 25, drawing on J. M. Baumgartner, "On the Testimony of Women in 1QSa," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (1957), 266-69.

scripture was minimal.

20 Women's voices were also considered shameful when heard in public. This would certainly make public teaching by women indecent at the very least. All this Rabbinic criticism of women has echoes in Paul. We will see later in the discussion of particular Pauline texts the constant tension in his mind between the new-found freedom and equality of men and women in Christ and the traditional restrictions placed on women by Jewish law and custom. The fact that restrictions on women's participation in public worship were part of a larger cultural attitude toward women which has now been abandoned forces us seriously to ask whether these restrictions may not be abandoned also.

Since the exclusion of women was part of a culture-wide system of mores, it also raises the question of whether, if Jesus and the disciples had been completely free from these ideas, they would have been historical at all. If Jesus is not subject to the general historical conditions of the time in which He was born, at least to some degree, has He really been incarnated or do we have a docetic Christ? Jesus broke with some of the social restrictions of His time that we have come to see as evil, but not, so far as we know, with others. He broke with Jewish Sabbatarian customs, but we have no record of His outright condemnation of slavery. He did not break the Jewish-Gentile distinctions all the time: Matthew 10:5, His instructions to the twelve when He sends them on their missionary journey; and Mark 7:27, His rather ferocious response to the Syro-Phoenecian woman. He did turn the usual standards of value about wealth and poverty, mourning and joy, persecution, and many other things upside-down. (Matthew 5:1-11) But He did not

20. Strack and Billerbeck, I, 299; II, 469.

attempt the direct reform of corrupt institutions like the Temple hierarchy or the Roman tax system. So Jesus did not seek to realize in His own day all that we see implied in His life and teaching. He could have spoken against slavery, corrupt taxation, the idolatry of Rome, but He was content to allow all these to exist provided His followers recognized that their primary loyalty was to God. Most importantly, Christ did not create the perfect world by His incarnation, but accepted the limitations of this one. His incarnation as man is merely pretense unless He accepts the limitations of man, and these include limitations of knowledge and perception.

In Jesus's time the position of women was especially bad. Josephus capsulizes the attitude of the first century toward women: "the woman is in every respect less than the man."²¹ In the light of this prejudice, the argument that we should expect Jesus and the early church to overcome all objections to the full service of women in the life of the church is hardly fair when we do not make the same demands of the New Testament position on slavery and economic exploitation. We cannot apply one standard of expectations to the position of women, arguing that if women priests are possible the New Testament would mention it, and another to slavery, claiming that it was necessary for the conscience of the community to develop the implications of the New Testament message before slavery could be seen for the evil that it is. The argument that because Jesus and the early church appointed no women priests we cannot do so now is completely spurious, does not take the historical incarnation seriously, and thus verges on docetism and gnosticism. It restricts us to the customs of the first century church in

21. Oepke, I, 782.

meeting the problems of the twentieth, rather than allowing us in Christian freedom to seek to fulfill the will of God for our own time.

Another minor point of Biblical interpretation must be dealt with before we move on to particular texts. The church today cannot simply appeal to obedience to the Bible in the matter of whether or not to have women priests. Paul spends as much time discussing other concerns as he does the position of women. For instance, Christians may not appeal to non-Christian judges (I Corinthians 6:1-11). Many other Biblical rules are not now obeyed by members of the church. To state it simply, why abandon the authoritativeness of I Corinthians 6:1-11 and retain that of I Corinthians 11:2-16? Those who argue from texts have the duty of justifying their concern with obedience to this particular text, since we are obviously so selective in the texts we obey. This fact of our selectivity makes us move the argument off purely Biblical grounds and appeal to other sorts of evidence as well.

CHAPTER IV

THE BIBLICAL EVIDENCE: SPECIFIC TEXTS

I Corinthians 11:2-16

This passage is important because those arguing against women's ordination frequently cite it, although with diverse interpretations and to prove different things. John Paul Boyer uses it as one of a number of verses showing that the trend of the whole Bible is against the ordination of women,¹ Allmen to prove that grace is to be mediated to women through men,² and Harold Riley to claim that the subordination taught by the passage limits the conduct of worship to men.³

This text has been used to deny priesthood to women since ancient times. The first specific example I have found is in the Commentaries of Isho 'Dad of Merv (ca. 850).

Thus, "A man ought not to cover his head," and the rest of the section; first, because of the affinity that man has with spiritual beings in form; second, because of the image of the headship of Christ which He forms over all, which is priesthood in the church, given to men alone; third, because natural advantages are more proper to man because he was created first; fourth, because

1. John Paul Boyer, "The 'Open Mind' and the Mind of Christ," in H. Karl Lutge (ed.), Sexuality-Theology-Priesthood (San Gabriel: Concerned Fellow Episcopalians, n.d.), p. 50.

2. Allmen, in Lutge, p. 34.

3. Riley, in Lutge, p. 9.

"the man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man." Everything that exists for the sake of others is less than that on whose account it exists; as the bowman is greater than the work of the bow; fifth, because he is the head, but she is below the head.⁴

Many earlier references to Paul or "the apostle" as forbidding women priests, or public roles to women, probably refer to this passage. There were other ways the early church dealt with this passage, as I show on page 141-142 below.

Despite the consistent usage of this text in the church against the ordination of women, it is beset with difficulties of exegesis. If so great a scholar as Leitzmann calls parts of it incomprehensible, we should be very careful in claiming to have discovered the meaning of the text, even in its original setting, much less what it speaks to us today.⁵ Like so much other material in the Pauline letters, it is only one side of a correspondence, one half a conversation of which we do not know the other half. Therefore its interpretation can be very difficult. This makes Paul's logic seem obscure to us; for instance, what is the exact relation between verse 3 and the rest of the passage? What does *ἡ ἑξουσία* mean in verse 10, and why worry about the angels? After establishing and justifying differences between men and women in verses 8 and 9, how does Paul relate this to verses 11 and 12, which seem to throw his whole attempt to justify differences between men's and women's

4. The Commentaries of Isho 'Dad of Merv (Cambridge University Press, 1916), p. 35. Isho 'Dad of Merv, fl. ca. 850, Nestorian Bishop of Hediahatha, was a great historical commentator and Biblical exegete. His exegesis represents the height of a reform movement in Syriac Christianity which attempted to unite the allegorical and historical-grammatical methods of interpretation.

5. E. B. Allo, Première Épître aux Corinthiens (Paris: Gabalda, 1956), p. 263. See the appendix for a translation of this commentary on this passage.

behavior at worship into a cocked hat. There are other problems. Any attempt to use this verse in the argument concerning the ordination of women must proceed from a careful exegesis that faces these difficulties.

First, this passage is set at the beginning of a long section which seeks to remove certain specific abuses in public worship. (I Corinthians 11:2 - 14:40) So the first question is whether these directions of Paul's to women apply mainly to public worship or not. What is the setting in which Paul's advice is to apply? Paul himself does not say. Three points suggest that Paul's concern in this passage is specifically with behavior in public worship. 1. The term *προφήτης*, in Paul means a person who speaks in the assembly (cf. I Corinthians 12:28).⁶ Prophecy was a liturgical function, so rules for proper behavior while engaged in prophecy apply to the assembled church. 2. The beginning of verse 2 parallels that of verses 17 and 22. *ἐταλυνω* is used in all three places. This implies a self-conscious literary unit, all of which is obviously concerned with communal worship. 3. Paul appeals, in verse 16, to the practice of the churches of God, a matter of congregational worship or at least of common concern. It implies a necessarily public scandal as opposed to a private offense. The practice of the church is the practice of the community at worship.

So probably Paul is seeking here to regulate practices in community worship. Women are to be veiled at public services. This is important when we seek to discover exactly what part women were playing in early church worship. It also shows that Paul's attempt is not to set down a universally valid general rule, but to regulate specific acts

6. G. Friedrich, "*προφήτης*," in G. Kittel (ed.) Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), VI, 848.

(wearing or not wearing a veil) at a specific place (Corinth).

Most exegetes see this section as the answer to a question pressed in a previous Corinthian letter to Paul, 11:2 being a quotation of or reference to an argument the Corinthians used to justify their non-veiling of women.⁷ It strikes me that Paul is finding it difficult to construct arguments that convince. Note his warm tone and the variety of his appeals: to nature, verse 14; to the customs of the church, verse 16; to creation, verses 8 and 9.⁸ His final point, "If anyone is disposed to be contentious. . ." (I Corinthians 11:16) indicates that some were probably so inclined, i.e. this passage is a window on a continuing argument between Paul and at least some members of the church in Corinth. The variety of appeals and the cutting off of discussion by appeal to authority in verse 16 indicate that Paul is replying to another's position. My guess would be that some, at least, of the Corinthians saw nothing wrong with allowing women to worship unveiled and were pushing that position, using as support the fact that Paul had not preached against unveiled women during his first visit.⁹

The Greek mystery religions allowed women to have uncovered heads and disheveled hair.¹⁰ Therefore Greek converts would see nothing new or strange in unveiled women taking part in public worship in their new faith. Therefore, I Corinthians 11:2 would be the Corinthian argument:

7. John C. Hurd, The Origin of I Corinthians (New York: Seabury Press, 1965), p. 185.

8. James Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938), p. 150.

9. Hurd, p. 185.

10. Annie Jaubert, "Le Voile des Femmes (I Cor. XI.2-16)," New Testament Studies, XVII (1972), 424.

they had been keeping Paul's rules and the veiling of women had not been mentioned before. In the rest of the passage Paul is out to change their position.

This reconstruction is admittedly speculative, but the main point is much more certain, that Paul was dealing with what he conceived as an abuse in the practice of community worship at Corinth and that some, at least, in Corinth were inclined to question his decision.

What Paul tries to prove is that if women speak in community worship they must be veiled. To be veiled here does not mean to wear a covering for the face, but for the hair and the top and back of the head.¹¹ Paul tries to support this position, using as an argument woman's proper place in the orders of creation. Before we analyze these arguments it is important to note the general tenor of the text. Paul does not appeal to the fall of woman, but to the cosmic order that expresses the Creator's full will.¹² Paul tries to justify his position on the basis of an order where human relationships may conform fully to the divine will; he relies on Genesis 2:18-24 rather than on Genesis 3:16. In his reliance on the stories of creation rather than the fall, Paul is very positive toward woman in contrast with the Rabbinic traditions that based their theories about woman on her position as the causal agent of the fall and on the punishment God afterward imposed on her. He is also in tension with I Timothy 2:12-15 on precisely these points. Woman's participation in the cult at all was a breakthrough. This positive aspect of the text must be kept in mind; it is at least

11. Ronald de Vaux, "Sur le Voile des Femmes dans Orient Ancien," Revue Biblique, XLIV (1936), 397-412.

12. Jaubert, p. 419-20.

seeking to define the proper circumstances for woman's participation in worship and is therefore opposed to any attempt to limit woman's role to a passive one. This text is not congruent with attempts to show the priesthood must be masculine because only the masculine can represent the activity of God in the world while the feminine represents the receptivity of God. Here Paul defines the condition for feminine public liturgical activity.

Verse 3: "But I want you to understand that the head of every man (ἄνδρως) is Christ, the head of a woman (γυναικος) is her husband (ἄνθρωπος) and the head of Christ is God." This establishes a series of relationships between God, Christ, man, and woman. The relationship is called "headship." These relations form the general principles upon which the rest of the passage is built. To us, to be a head means to be ruler or chief. But Liddel and Scott do not list that as a meaning for κεφαλή.¹³ Such an image would have been much more obscure for an ancient Greek who did not associate thinking and directing with the head. According to both Bedale¹⁴ and Schlier,¹⁵ κεφαλή and ἀρχή come very close to meaning the same thing in the New Testament. Therefore, the sort of headship man exercises over woman comes from the woman's having begun in man or from the temporal priority of man's creation.¹⁶ It does not come

13. Robin Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman: Revisited," Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XLII:3 (1974), 534-35, n. 8.

14. Stephen Bedale, "The Meaning of κεφαλή in the Pauline Epistles," Journal of Theological Studies, V:3 (1954), 211-12.

15. H. Schlier, "κεφαλή," in G. Kittel, III, 677; see also C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 248.

16. Else Kähler, Die Frau in den Paulinischen Briefen (Zürich: Gottelf, 1960), p. 52.

from some inherently superior organizing power or superior native talent in man. Interpreted in this way, verse 3 also fits in better with verse 8, where the emphasis is on temporal and causal priority.

Furthermore, the headship of man to woman is paralleled by that of God to Christ, so any implication of inferiority is excluded for us, unless we want to make Paul the first Arian. The most this verse implies is a different position in the structure of creation; the authority of man derives from temporal priority. The ancient world accepted the authority of the past, that which is oldest is most weighty, and this is the base of Paul's exegesis of Genesis. But can such an argument carry authority for us now? Paul's interpretation of the headship of man over woman because man was created first thus becomes problematic for us.

To reinforce this interpretation, notice that in verse 8 man is not the lord, the *κυριος*, of the woman, but the origin of her being. In this Paul relies on Genesis 2:18-23 rather than on Genesis 1:27. The whole question of the exegesis of the Genesis passages has been dealt with earlier. Also in verse 7 the woman is not the image of man, only his glory. Paul quite pointedly does not complete the parallel with verse 7a. Woman's image, as does man's, comes from God.¹⁷ Any notion of inherent intellectual or spiritual incapacity is missing.

So Verse 3 is talking about a chain of relationships in creation, as Paul understood it, and not about a mere hierarchy of authority. The implication is that each element finds its meaning not in itself but in the other elements up the chain. There is a significant difference between finding meaning in one's origin and having the origin exercise

17. Barrett, p. 249.

authority over one. Assuming for an instant that Paul does mean common-sense authority, even this would not allow man the free exercise of his will over woman, for the authority of man is as subject to Christ as the woman is to the man. Ultimately, the one authority is God. Woman's position is still not equal to that of man in this verse, but the force of any subordination is greatly reduced. Man as the "head" of woman implies not ruling and ruled but originating being and derivative being.

Verse 4: "Any man who prays or prophesies with his head covered disgraces his head." The popular interpretation is that the veil interferes with reflecting the glory of Christ.¹⁸ In verse 7a man is instructed to worship unveiled because he is the image and glory of God. Most exegetes refer to this to explain verse 4, but the logic seems a bit confused, since in verse 3 it is Christ who is the head of man and not God directly. I am not sure whether I am missing something or Paul is careless.

The important text for interpreting this passage is II Corinthians 3. Here the veil over Moses's face does not allow the Israelites to see the glory of God reflected there. As the veil is removed for Moses every time he goes to speak to God, so the veil is removed between Christ and the believer at the meeting together of the church. Note that the unveiled face is associated with freedom (II Corinthians 3:17) and with changing into the likeness of Christ (II Corinthians 3:18). It was the expectation and hope of many Jews to recover in the last days the lost glory of Adam, in whom the glory of God was reflected.¹⁹ If the Christians are the new Adam, the new people for whom the

18. Allo, p. 257; Barrett, p. 250.

19. Jaubert, p. 433.

veil is removed, then they will reflect the glory of God as Moses did, and to interfere with this is to deny the new work of Christ. For men to be veiled would be a symbol of interference with the free communication between God and man instituted by Christ.

Verse 5: "but any woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled dishonors her head--it is the same as if her head were shaven."

The Jewish tradition believed that the glory was conferred on Adam before the creation of woman.²⁰ "Why are males counted and not women?"

(In a census) Because the glory of God shines on man."²¹ Paul apparently accepts this idea; at any rate, man derives his glory from Christ and woman does not. But there is a twist: the Rabbinic authors use this reasoning to exclude women from activity in public worship and Paul²² does not.

Paul accepts the interpretation that woman finds her origin and meaning in man. That is the order of creation and is expressed by calling woman the glory of man (verse 7). In the face of God during public worship the glory of man must be hidden; if woman prays or prophesies with an uncovered head it is for man's glory, not God's. The implication of verses 11-12, especially "and all things are from God," is that the effacement of man's glory in the veiled woman permits her also to²³ reflect the glory of God. Notice that in II Corinthians 3:13 the veil

20. Genesis Rabba 8:10.

21. Numbers Rabba 3:8 on Numbers 3:15.

22. The unity between praying or prophesying with uncovered head and having the head shaved is that they are both unnatural. The relation between veiling and having long hair, or short hair and not veiling, is obscure to me.

23. M. D. Hooker, "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of I Cor. 11:10," New Testament Studies, X (1963-64), 414; see also Barrett, p. 253.

is hiding what was already present in Moses; it is not hiding Moses from something outside himself. The situation here is parallel. The veil is used to hide the splendor of man. Also notice what many exegetes have missed, that the veil allows woman to pray and prophesy in public and with honor. If the veil is to Paul a symbol of subjection, it is a symbol whose appropriation leads to effective equality of woman and man in community worship.²⁴

I propose the following as a hypothetical reconstruction of events at Corinth to explain the complexity of this passage. The Corinthian church was probably composed of both Jewish and Gentile elements (Acts 18:1-17).²⁵ The women of Greek background would be used to uncovered heads in worship from the ceremonies of the mystery religions. In other circumstances they would be veiled.²⁶ The Jews would see unveiling for religious ceremonies as indecent. For a woman to go unveiled in public was grounds for divorce.²⁷ It was such an infringement on his right as a husband that he did not have to pay the sum stipulated in the marriage contract in the case of a divorce. That is, the woman had already started to commit adultery. For a woman to have her head covered with long hair and a kerchief or hair net was a sign that she was married and

24. Phillipe-H. Menoud, "St. Paul et le Femme," Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie, XIX:5 (1968), 325-26; see also Hooker, p. 413-14.

25. I am aware that the historical details of Acts are not as accurate as they might be, but Paul's pattern of preaching first to the Jews and then to the Gentiles seems pretty firm. A mixture of the two in the Corinthian church seems not at all unlikely.

26. Aristophanes, "Lysistrata," (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 55. The veil is a sign of the subjection of the wife to the husband.

27. Babylonian Talmud, (Gittim 90a).

belonged to her husband.

Paul may then in this passage be trying to settle a dispute between the Jewish and Gentile factions of the congregation. This interpretation is strengthened by Paul's appeal in verse 16 to the practice of the other churches, which would probably be those older churches of Syrian and Palestinian origin, i.e. Jewish Christians, who would be conservative about the matter of veils. The implication is that the Corinthians want to do something the other churches do not do.²⁹ Paul is trying to settle a dispute that has arisen between groups who have different conceptions of decency and natural order and to discover some way to preserve the unity of the church. He opts for the Jewish position but modifies it in a Christian direction in verses 11-12. To support the subordination of woman using this text is to confuse the purpose at which Paul is aiming, harmony and decency in the congregation, with the tools he uses to form his argument, that woman's position in creation demands she be veiled. It is also not taking the spirit of Paul very seriously, for Paul obviously wants to lay down conditions under which women can play a leading role in worship. This text tells of an expansion of the part women can play in the cult beyond what Judaism permitted. It therefore runs exactly counter to Riley's claim that it supports the position that the Bible forbids women to play a prominent role³⁰ in the cult.

28. A. Isaksson, Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple: A Study with Special Reference to Mt. 19:3-12 and I Cor. 11:3-16 (Lund: Gleerup, 1965), p. 163.

29. Jaubert, p. 419.

30. Riley, p. 9; Boyer, p. 50.

Verse 10: "That is why a woman ought to have authority on her head, because of the angels." Here the woman is directed to put authority upon her head. This authority has the effect of permitting her to do something--speak in public worship--which she otherwise should not do, and according to the Jewish customs of the time could not do. The veil is therefore a sign of authority, of the woman's authority in cult worship that frees her from the exclusive control of her husband and allows her to participate. This verse has received many interpretations. It is important to notice in interpreting the Bible what direction of movement the various currents of ideas have. Paul is moving toward more freedom than contemporary Jews allowed women, and this movement toward freedom must be remembered if we wish to understand the mind of Paul.

The reference to angels in verse 10 probably refers to them as guardians of the created order. Women and men should follow this order

31. A. Feuillet, "La Dignité et le Rôle de la Femme D'après Quelques Textes Pauliniens: Comparaison avec l'Ancien Testament," New Testament Studies, XXI (1975), 160.

32. The great variety of interpretations is confusing, but I have sorted out a limited number of general types. I offer the following list:

Hans Leitzmann, An die Korinther (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949), I Pt. 2; 55. The veil gives power to women to ward off the fallen angels of the spiritual world. See also my translation of E.-B. Allo's Excursus IX "The 'Authority' on the Head (XI:10)," p. 3a for the history of this interpretation.

even though it begins to break down in the closeness of the Christian's
³³
 approach to God. But in the Lord man and woman are not independent.
 (Verse 11) Paul wants both to recognize the validity of the orders of
 creation and at the same time to transcend them in the Lord, the new
 Adam, the post-resurrection community. This is the already but not yet
 of the eschatological reservation so prominent in some parts of Paul's
 writing. This dual perspective adds not a little to the difficulty of
 this passage.

The structure of the passage is also illuminating. Verse 3
 states the general form of relations among men, women, Christ, and God.
 Verse 4 is an application of these general principles to public prayer
 and prophecy by men. For man to wear a veil disgraces his head; that is,
 it is inappropriate to the relation stated in verse 3. Verse 7a gives
 theological reasons for verse 3: the man is the image and glory of God
 and therefore does not wear a veil. The first use of head in verse 4
 is literal; the second is metaphoric, referring to Christ. The literal
 head is disgraced because it does not reflect the glory of the metaphoric
³⁴
 head, Christ. Verse 5 is an application of the principles of
 verse 3 to public prayer and prophecy by women. It parallels verse 4
 and balances it. Verse 7b gives theological justification for a dis-
 tinction between man and woman in respect to glory.

In verses 5b and 6 Paul is giving a different, or at least an

33. J. A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of I Cor. XI:10," New Testament Studies, IV (1957-1958), 57. He proposes that in the natural order the unveiled head of a woman was seen as a bodily defect, and therefore disturbed the angels who were present in the same way as bodily defects made it impossible to be a priest, or as a defective animal could not be offered in sacrifice.

34. Allo, pp. 257-58; Barrett, p. 250.

additional, reason for woman to wear a veil: if she is unveiled it is the same as if she were shaved. Verses 6-10 are the theological justification for verses 4 and 5a. Verses 5b and 6 seem to be very loosely connected with the context. For the Greeks, to be a shaven woman, that is one with her hair cut short, was a great disgrace.³⁵ Menander's play, "ΠΕΡΙΚΛΕΙΟΜΕΝΗ"³⁶ turns around the disgrace of a girl whose hair is cut short by a jealous lover. As mentioned above, for the Jewish woman to be seen without a veil was grounds for divorce. I wonder if in verses 5b and 6 Paul is not trying to establish some kind of common ground between the Greek and Jewish notions of proper behavior for women. The Greek horror of short hair is equated with the Jewish horror of being unveiled.

Verse 6 is a repetition and enlargement of verse 5. Paul restates the connection between having the hair cut short and not wearing a veil.

In verse 7 Paul again tries to justify the difference in custom between man and woman; it is a theological justification for verse 4. What the relation is between man as the image and glory of God, and Christ as the head of man, is not stated. Paul's logic is losing its tightness. The implication is that this is just a further explanation of the general principle of headship given in verse 3. Man ought not to be veiled because it cuts off the image and glory of God from being seen

35. Aristophanes, "Thesmophoriazousae," 838; The Acts of Thomas, logion 56, in New Testament Apocrypha (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), II, 474.

36. Menander, "Pericleriomene," The Plays of Menander (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), pp. 197-281.

37

in him.

Verses 8 and 9 are proof of verse 7b, that woman is the glory of man. Verse 10 is the conclusion and summary of the argument that woman is the glory of man and therefore ought to have authority on her head if she is to pray in public. The ideas in verse 8 are derived from the J account in Genesis 2:21. Man is before woman because woman is made from man's rib. None of the other animals were adequate helpers for man, so woman was created by God for the express purpose of helping man. I.e., she finds her meaning in him and derives her being from him; she is his glory. But Paul's purpose in this passage is not to justify the subordination of woman, but to impose a condition, being veiled, on her equal participation with man in the cult. It remains a subordinating passage, but one with a thrust from a comfortable subordinationism toward a questioning of the idea. Most commentators speak as if the veil were a sign of submission, when it could just as reasonable be regarded as a means toward equality and freedom. The veil allows woman to overcome the state of being merely the glory of man. Since women in the Christian communities were then praying and prophesying in public, contrary to Jewish practice, they needed a sign of their authority to do so. Veiling women effaces the glory of man. This fits well with Ramsey's idea that the veil is a sign of dignity for the woman. It allows her to do a new thing.

Verse 10a: "That is why a woman ought to have a veil on her head." This is the conclusion of Paul's main line of argument. Only late and secondary sources actually have *καλυμμα* in the text. The RSV

37. Isaksson, p. 174, presents evidence that the image of God would have been literally thought of as short haired: Daniel 7:9. The sheep's wool referred to in this verse was a short, curly variety.

admits in a footnote that the Greek word is "ἐξουσία," "authority," but puts veil in the text anyway on the grounds that authority means veil here. It is a blatant example of interpretative theory changing the translation of the text. The common interpretation is that the veil is the sign of the husband's authority. This is simply not what the text says; it contains not a word about the veil being a sign of man's authority. Instead Paul argues that the veil gives the woman the right to speak. Notice that ἐξουσία breaks a parallelism. Instead of saying that women should be veiled as opposed to men who should not, Paul says
38
women should have authority on their heads.

Verse 10b seems to be tacked on with no explanation, and to form a subsidiary reason for the veil. In Fitzmyer's article angels are seen as mediating prophecy. *δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων* then could be the woman's authority to be a prophet because angels speak to her; that is, she wears the sign of authority precisely because she is a true prophet. This is a rather original interpretation because it sees angels functioning differently than as guardians of the created order. As a true prophet she
39
is not reflecting man's glory.

Verses 11 and 12 form a contrast and tension with verses 8 and 9. Here Paul does not assert either equality or subordination but mutual dependence. The word "πλὴν" at the beginning of the verse suggests that the contrast is between relation in the Lord and the relation with
40
the angels. The phrase ἐν κυρίῳ means "in the church," so that when the church assembles the authority of man and woman is balanced by means

38. Hooker, p. 413.

39. Fitzmyer, p. 49.

40. Caird, p. 279.

of the acknowledgement of distinctions, that is, by veiling of women.⁴¹
 It may be contrasted with the common Jewish idea that man's partnership
 with woman was mainly for procreation.⁴² Here Paul talks about inter-
 dependence in the Lord, not in procreation. Verses 8 and 9 established
 man as the *κεφαλὴ* of woman because of temporal priority, verse 12 estab-
 lishes woman as the origin of man in the universal process of birth.
 Here we see the tension in Paul between freedom for women in the Lord
 and Paul's own Rabbinic background.

Verse 13--Paul here returns to the question of woman's activity
 in community worship. He switches the argument from an exegesis of the
 Genesis Yahwist creation story to an appeal to nature. Verses 14 and 15
 follow the Stoic manner of natural law argumentation rather than the
 Rabbinic.⁴³ Paul distinguishes between man's hair and woman's as differ-
 ent in the order of nature (*φύσις*). Hair was seen in the Hellenistic
 world as one of the symbols of the stability of that world order through
 its ability to separate and rank man and woman. I do not know how signi-
 ficant it was, but there are a number of witnesses.⁴⁴ But here still
 the thrust of the passage is not subjection per se but what is decent
 and natural behavior, for both men and women alike. If the point of the
 passage is seen as subjection, we need to remember that man too is sub-
 ject; and his unnatural behavior is mentioned in verse 14, condemned,
 and contrasted with that of the woman.

41. Menoud, p. 326.

42. Genesis Rabba 8:8.

43. Allo, p. 262.

44. Epictetus, *Discourses*, 3:1:24-25., 1:16:9-14; Pseudo-Phocylides
 212; Philo, *De vita Mosis*, 1:54.

Again we see the interplay of Greek and Jewish motifs. Paul may adopt a natural law form of argumentation, but for the Jews, really long hair on a man was a sign of apostasy from Israel.⁴⁵ In Ezekiel 44:20 the priests in the new Temple to be built in the perfection of God's rule are specifically described as short haired. Perhaps Paul is trying to bridge the gap between the two parts of the Corinthian congregation again.

What are we to make out of this extremely difficult passage for our question? First, it is exceedingly difficult to know what Paul meant, except that he believed women should be veiled in public worship. The church no longer accepts that as authoritative. If we reject Paul's major intention in this passage, how justified are we in using it to prove things that Paul did not intend it to prove? The main concern of the text is to preserve decency; to connect this with the subordination of women or their capacity to perform certain functions requires a lot of assumptions that are not present in the text itself. The text does not mention priesthood anyway, except as the laity lead the Christian community. I hope that nobody now would say Christian laywomen lack rights Christian laymen possess, but to claim the text refers to the subordination of women requires that we apply it to the laity first, since Paul is talking about them and not about a special class of priests.

Paul also bases his opinions about the man-woman relation on a certain type of Old Testament exegesis; for instance, he uses the Yahwist account but ignores the Priestly. Can we accept as authoritative an exegesis based on such selective use of the Bible material? Can we also

45. Deuteronomy Rabba 2:18.

accept the literalistic idea that man is temporally prior to woman, or that the only place a woman can really find her meaning is in her husband? These are general ideas that Paul is applying not just to a special class within the church but to all church members. If one is to allow the modern world to exist and at the same time use this passage against the ordination of women, one needs to justify the remarkable shift in emphasis from Paul's universalism to the present application of the text exclusively to the priesting of women.⁴⁶

Finally, we see in the text a tension between subordinationism and freedom. Paul's arguments from Genesis seem subordinationist, but he is not comfortable with letting them stand alone. He asserts the necessary partnership of men and women in the Lord, and he defends woman's right to speak in church services provided she follows certain standards of decency. Paul is remarkably balanced for his age; he also outlines and justifies standards of decency for men in the same areas of concern. The thrust of the passage may indeed have restrained the Corinthians, but it is certainly moving away from the rigidities of Rabbinic tradition. It stands in marked contrast with I Timothy 2:11-15. That passage lacks any sense of moderation and balance; it is exclusively directed at women and is without the mutuality that is present in I Corinthians 11:11-12. In fact, a careful reading of this Corinthian passage shows that Paul does not discuss subordination of women at all, but only how they are distinct from men.

We are left to deal with von Allmen's contention that this text, especially verse 3, indicates that "God reaches men by Christ, and

46. Note that in order to use this passage as an argument against ordination of women, it must be taken literally. If it is taken literally how can the wearing of mitres by bishops during services be explained?

Christ reaches women by men. This undoubtedly implies the converse also;
 just as men reach God by Christ so women reach Christ by men." ⁴⁷ This
 is utterly remote from the text, which says nothing about $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$
 denoting the mode of divine mediation. It is a gratuitous assumption
 that because man is the $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$ of women, he is the necessary mediator
 of grace to her. It is also a very strange assumption for a Protestant
 theologian, for whom the direct access and relation between God and
 every person ought to be of fundamental importance. ⁴⁸

I Corinthians 14:33b-36

The position of this passage in the debate over the ordination of
 women is a key one. It has commonly been used to deny not only the
 possibility of ordaining women but also their participation in any visi-
 ble position in the public ministry of the church. Origen, Ambrosiaster,
 Epiphanius of Salamis, Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Jerome, among the
 ancients, use it to deny the ability of women to fill roles requiring
 authority in the church, including that of the ordained clergy. ⁴⁹ In
 more modern times F. Sola, J. Wahl, L. Lercher, and Dielkamp-Hoffmann
 use it to deny the possibility of women priests. ⁵⁰ The general

47. Allmen, p. 34.

48. Note that von Allmen's position denies the efficacy of baptism for women; they ought not to be baptised into Christ but into the community of men who fulfill for them the mediatorial functions that Christ fills for men. It is also contradicted by Hebrews, where the whole human race reaches God through Christ, the one high priest.

49. For Ambrosiaster see his Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Corinthians, in Patrologia Latina, XVII, c. 273. For Jerome see bibliography XLIII. For the others see my chapter on the church fathers.

50. D. Sola, Sacra Theologiae Summa (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores

reasoning is that since this passage rejects any speaking by women in church services, the specific speaking required of the priest is also forbidden. Thus there is a primary and initial weakness in the position of all who use this passage in the debate in the Episcopal church. Women may already speak with authority in our liturgical services. Having violated this passage if we take it literally, the need becomes not to defend the truth of the passage itself but to account for our selective application of it. No literature I have seen makes any attempt to justify using this passage to prevent the ordination of women priests and not women deacons, to prevent the ordination of women priests and not to stop the lecturing of women theologians.

The meaning of this passage seems much less ambiguous than that of I Corinthians 11:2-16, but it is again full of pitfalls for any attempt to apply it to the problem at hand. First, there is the question whether the text is really pauline. Opinions vary from Andre Dumas,⁵¹ who thinks it genuine, to Lietzmann who says it is probably a later gloss,⁵² to J. Liepoldt who is sure that it is.⁵³ C. K. Barrett takes the middle path. For him the evidence is uncertain but slightly in favor

Christianos, 1953), 710.

J. Wahl, The Exclusion of Women from Holy Orders (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1959), 14.

L. Lercher, Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae, IV-2 pars Altera, 3rd. ed. (Innsbruck, 1950), 316-7.

Dielkamp-Hoffmann, Theologiae dogmaticae manuale (Paris, 1946), IV, 426.

51. A. Dumas, "Biblical Anthropology and the Participation of Women in the Ministry of the Church," in Concerning the Ordination of Women (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1964), 18.

52. Lietzmann, p. 75.

53. J. Liepoldt, Die Frau in der Antiken Welt und im Christentum (Leipzig, 1954), p. 190.

54

of the passage being post-pauline.

Four reasons are given for believing the passage a gloss.

1. It seems to contradict I Corinthians 11:2-16, where women are unmistakably given the right to speak in worship services under certain conditions. Dumas claims that these verses refer to worship open to non-Christians, while I Corinthians 11:2-16 refer to worship strictly confined to the Christian community.⁵⁵ I Corinthians 14:24 seems to indicate he may be right. If so, the worship referred to in I Corinthians 11 is probably Eucharistic, which was closed to outsiders very early in the church's history. If Dumas is correct in this speculation then there is no contradiction between I Corinthians 11 and 14. It would also imply that women were excluded from leadership positions in these circumstances because the non-believers would be scandalized.⁵⁶

Schmithals finds I Corinthians 14:33b-36 to be genuinely pauline,⁵⁷ but to me his thesis seems speculative. He splits I Corinthians into two letters and claims this passage belongs to the second, while 11:2-16 belongs to the first. In the face of feminine pressure for participation in worship, Paul has hardened in a conservative direction. This approach avoids the problem of Paul's consistency by postulating an internal development in him. These two texts then mark two stages of that development. There needs to be more evidence that there was, in fact,

54. Barrett, pp. 330-333.

55. Dumas, p. 18.

56. For another example of this see the Didascalia 15.3.5-6. Here, again, women are forbidden to teach because the non-Christians would be scandalized.

57. Walter Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1965), p. 311.

external feminine pressure on Paul.

Robertson and Plummer suggest that I Corinthians 11:5 may be hypothetical or apply merely to exceptional cases while I Corinthians 14:33b-36 expresses the general mind of Paul. No real evidence is given
58
for either of these opinions.

As the above show, there is considerable disagreement on whether this verse is pauline or not, and if it is pauline how it may be made to agree with I Corinthians 11:2-16. Therefore it is practically impossible to either fit the verse into some general understanding of the theology of Paul or to reject it. Judgment needs to be suspended.

2. Chapter 14 deals with the regulation of prophetic activities and I Corinthians 14:33b-36 deals with the behavior of women in general in the church. It therefore does not fit into the development of thought in chapter 14.

3. The appeal to the law in verse 34 is not a pauline use of the word law. Can the same person who writes this be angry at the Galatians for their subservience to the law?

4. Finally, there is a textual problem. In the Western texts, (D,G, o.1.) verses 34-35 are linked to the end of verse 40. Since verse 30 links well to verse 36, there is support for the idea that this passage is a later gloss, especially when its similarity to I Timothy 2:11 is seen.

If this text is pauline, it is the earliest one forbidding women to speak in Christian worship. It also creates a tension between itself

58. A. Robertson and A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), pp. 324-325.

and the rest of Paul's thought, where there is no hint of woman's participation in worship being restricted and where, indeed, her role is expanded beyond anything seen in contemporary Judaism. If the text is not pauline, then it reflects the thought of a generation or two after the apostolic church, and fits into the general movement away from the freedom of the first generation and into a much more rigidly determined hierarchy and tighter organization. If the text is pauline, it becomes a difficult anomaly; if it is not, then it fits the general picture of the development of the early church.

Verses 34 and 35 are parallel. Each begins with an imperative directing a certain kind of behavior for women. Verse 34 orders women to keep silence in the churches, verse 35a opens the possibility of speaking in private. Verses 34b and 35a give reasons for these commands. Verse 34b gives a reason coming from a Jewish background, obedience to the law. Verse 35b gives a reason coming from Jewish and Hellenistic custom, the impropriety of a woman's voice being heard in public. Verse 36 is an appeal to the authority of the whole community of Christian churches. (Cf. I Corinthians 11:16) Apparently the Corinthians were setting up what Paul conceived to be novel practices, and he was concerned to use the unity of all the churches as a means of moderating the Corinthians' practices.

Paul appeals to all sorts of proof. Verses 33b and 34 appeal to "all the churches of the saints," that is, the silence of women was a universal practice of the Christian community. The reason for this silence is "the law"; that is, after proof by universal Christian practice we have proof by ancient religious tradition. The logical progression is somewhat obscure. Somehow being subordinate implies not being

permitted to speak, and the law says to be subordinate. We are not told to what the women are to be subordinate. The text does not say it is to their husbands.

Verse 35 presents another reason for silence, this time a cultural one: it is shameful for women's voices to be heard in public.⁵⁹ I sense here the pressure of outside community norms on the form of life in the church, a situation to be expected after the collapse of the expectation of the immanent parousia. But today we are not bound to Greek customs about women's voices. We are also less sure that subordination means silence; we tend to encourage dialogue. Since women are not to speak in church, they are told how to deal with this restriction: ask your husband at home. Notice here that the family and the home are becoming primary for the woman rather than the ecclesial community. It is a hint that by the time of this passage the church has settled down to living in this world and is no longer expecting the parousia to happen tomorrow, when all human relations, including that of the family, would be submerged.

Verse 36 balances verses 33b and 34; it returns to the theme of universal Christian practice. Only instead of telling what the churches do, it accuses the Corinthians of trying to stand alone, and rather sarcastically informs them that they are out of step.

In verse 34a, compare the silence asked of women with that of a tongues-speaker when there is no interpretation (verse 28). This same sort of silence is required from all when one is given a sudden revelation (verse 30). The object of all these orders for silence is to

59. Barrett, p. 331. See also my chapter on the general situation of women in first-century Judaism, p. 33.

preserve decency and order (verse 40). Silence is needed to allow the community to worship as a community rather than as individuals. If it is this sort of silence that Paul refers to in verses 33b-36, it fits very well with verse 35 which pictures the women interrupting the service with questions that interfere with its flow, and consequently focus attention on the individual rather than the community. This is the one sort of non-silence that Paul mentions specifically in this passage and condemns.

But if it is this sort of self-centered questioning form of speech that is disturbing the worship of the Corinthian congregation, then the use of this passage against the ordination of women is a complete misunderstanding of its original purpose. Women need to keep silent only when they are disturbing community worship. The implication is that if a community were to authorize women to lead its worship that would be all right with Paul; the problem is not the women but the disturbance. Notice that Paul says the same thing about men in this chapter. This interpretation fits the context better than to suppose Paul is suspending all speech. If prophetic speech were meant, why the instruction to women to ask their husbands at home? Prophets do not ask questions; they deliver messages. Besides, if the text refers to prophetic speech, it still contradicts I Corinthians 11:2-16. This means that if the text is pauline, it refers to special circumstances that do not apply in the Episcopal church today. Women neither prophesy in the formal service, nor do they interrupt to ask questions, so both of the possibilities for what Paul may be concerned about in this text have no relevance to the question of the ordination of women.

60

60. Paradoxically, the Episcopal church's greatest disorder comes from

What is the law referred to in verse 34? It is probably Genesis 3:16 where the wife is told that her husband will rule over her. But Genesis 3:16 is not part of a law code in any strict sense. It is descriptive of the state of reality but not prescriptive for it, an explanation of the origin of the present human condition as it is in fact, not as it is normatively. The fact that the state described is the result of the fall shows this; it is not the state God intended for the human race. So if we accept Paul's appeal to Genesis as valid, we end up with more than we bargained for. The "law" in Genesis 3:16 is perfectly general; it does not apply just to relations within the church, but also to all life in the world, and therefore women ought not to hold any positions of authority over men. Those who would use this passage (I Corinthians 14:33b-36) to deny ordination to women must also apply it to positions of authority in all aspects of life, for the Old Testament imposes no limitations and Paul does not either. This is a radical conclusion, but anyone who limits the application of the passage specifically to ordination and does not accept universal subordination of women must shoulder the burden of proof for this lack of universal application.

As in all the New Testament passages dealing with women's right to speak in church, the question is: "What sort of speech are we concerned with here?" Is it all speech or a special kind? The word *λαλεειν* has two very different meanings. In classical Greek it means to chatter, but in Paul and especially in I Corinthians 14 it means the inspired

the denial of community through too great a silence. I consider the frozen silence and extreme individualism of the 8 A.M. Communion service and the effective silence of the church on social and ethical questions that shape and hurt our fellows to be an offense against that sense of community that lies at the heart of the Eucharist and that Paul is concerned to preserve.

speech of a prophet (verses 2, 3, 4, 5-6, 9, 11, 13, 18, 21, 23, 27, 28, 29, 39). Barrett thinks that it would be unlikely for Paul to contra-⁶¹dict this usage and have *λαλεῖν* refer to all speech.

As I have indicated, the passage seems to be more concerned with women asking questions than prophesying. Note that in I Corinthians 13:11 and I Timothy 5:13 *λαλεῖν* obviously means speech that is not Spirit-filled. The evidence seems to me too evenly balanced to really determine whether or not the author is doing anything other than forbidding untimely questions. If all speech is being forbidden to women, we have the problem of an inconsistency in Paul's thought, as well as the literary problem that this passage breaks the continuity of thought in the chapter in a rather serious way. If we accept the passage as non-pauline we still have the inconsistency: Paul permits women to speak publicly, this passage does not; one cannot have it both ways. There is also the inconsistency with present practice where women may speak. If this passage only prohibits certain forms of speech to women, it must be established that the forbidden form is one that priests must do. I have never seen such an attempt, but if the attempt is not made, then the passage becomes irrelevant to the question of the ordination of women today.

In verse 34b "to be subordinate" *ὑποταγεσθαι* does not necessarily mean to be subordinate to men, or one's husband. It may mean to⁶² be subordinate to the ordering of the Christian community in worship.

61. Barrett, p. 332.

62. Marga Buhrig, "The Question of the Ordination of Women in the Light of Some New Testament Texts," in Concerning the Ordination of Women (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1964), 47.

The same word for subordination is used for the prophets in verse 32 **ὑποτασσεται** . "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." The fact that the object to which women are to be subordinated is not directly identified adds to the confusion. If the passage is pauline, then the subordination is probably to the good order of the church in agreement with the rest of the chapter. If the passage is not pauline, then I have no idea what the women are to be subordinated to.

The command to ask their husbands at home about material they do not understand in the services comes from Rabbinic sources.⁶³ It reflects the general exclusion of women from public life in the first century. Verse 35 points directly at unrestrained and inopportune questioning as the problem. It does not square with the idea that the problem objected to is prophetic speech uttered by women.

What shall we make of all this for our question? As an isolated verse I Corinthians 14:33b-36 does not apply to the situation we face. If we confine ourselves strictly to what the author said, that women must keep silence in church, we break this rule with women deacons who are officially instructed to preach the Word, with women lay readers, with women teachers and theologians. We need to remember that the Christian priesthood as such did not exist in Paul's time, and his comments were directed at lay women. If we are willing to break the rule we appeal to for the very lay people to whom Paul first meant to apply it, we will have a hard time explaining why we wish to apply it to a group to whom he could never have had an idea of applying it. There were no Christian liturgical priests in Paul's day, women or otherwise, so Paul

63. H. Kosmola, "Gedanken zur Kontroverse Farbstein-Hoch," Judaica, IV, (1948), 234.

could hardly have intended his words to apply to them.

Paul was trying to bring order to a congregation whose worship was disordered by enthusiasm and by self-assertion. Today we have little enthusiasm and the gifts of the Spirit have small place in our worship, even for charismatics. The voice of the Spirit has become the voice of one man, the priest. Is the restriction in this passage still valid when we transpose it from a setting of confusion in worship and the consequent impossibility of any coherent teaching, to a situation where order and decency to the point of fossilization are the hallmarks of the church? Today the congregation must be enticed to participate in the service with gusto, and the problem is to get noise, not silence. To apply the verse literally in these circumstances is to ignore its intentions and to apply Paul's words to a situation he never connected with them.

Besides, it is not good interpretation to elevate a passage dealing with pastoral problems to the status of a statement on the ontological suitability of women for the priesthood. This passage does not speak to the capacity of women to become priests. There is only a disciplinary rule intended to deal with a time-conditioned problem that was disrupting the church at Corinth. The content of decency and order shift as the circumstances and condition of congregations shift. Therefore it is dangerous to make one form of good order universal for all times. I Corinthians 14 believed silence to be good order in its time; today the Spirit may ask a new thing.

Galatians 3:28

This text also has a key place in the debate on women's ordination. Those favoring ordination for women see here a justification for

their stand because of Paul's denial of the existence of ἄρσεν and
 θήλυ in Christ. Those who oppose the ordination of women try in
 different ways to limit the application of this passage. They have one
 fact on their side: the sexual distinction between men and women does
 not disappear after baptism. At least biologically, there are both men
 and women in the church. So Paul means something other than the dis-
 appearance of sexual distinctions. But what? No one has yet satisfied
 me as to precisely what Paul meant when he claims that the distinction
 between ἄρσεν and θήλυ does not exist in Christ. Since the text of
 Galatians 3:28 is not primarily concerned with the relations between men
 and women, it is hard to pin down precisely what Paul intended. The
 difficulty is increased since this passage is probably a quote from a
 baptismal liturgy and so perhaps not a pauline invention at all.

There are two general responses to this text by those who do not
 wish to ordain women. One is that of Jean Paul Boyer, who claims Gala-
 tians 3:28 refers to baptism and has no relevance to orders. He also
 claims that the passages in Corinthians are to be preferred in deciding
 our present course because they are more explicit.⁶⁴ J. J. von Allmen
 and H. Schlier echo the idea that the concern of this passage is with
 baptism,⁶⁵ which excludes any relevance to orders.

We are one in Christ only as baptised persons. If one
 recognizes this restriction on the statement in vs. 28, one is
 wary of drawing direct inferences for the order of Church office
 or for political society. Church office does not rest directly

64. Boyer, p. 50. It hardly seems in accord with God's mystery and
 transcendence that we should base the church's life and doctrine on a
 part of scripture just because it is easier to understand.

65. Allmen, pp. 29-36.

on baptism, but on commission, and political society is never identical with the body of Christ.⁶⁶

H. Riley sums it up when he says:

St. Paul is quite clear that "in Christ there is neither male nor female" (Gal. 3:28), but the fact that he states so when he is speaking of membership in the church makes it all the more significant that in other letters he insists that women are excluded from the liturgical functions of the ministry.⁶⁷

Besides the problem that if one really looks at the texts it is hard to find a place where Paul "insists" that women are excluded from liturgical functions, this sort of claim only makes it more pressing to find out what Paul really did mean.

There is another argument against using this text in the debate over the ordination of women. Oepke, in the article "ἡλικία" in TONT claims this passage is to be understood in the light of the coming era,⁶⁸ and therefore it does not demand action on our part to realize it now. He goes farther and says that although man-woman distinctions must remain in the present era, this present is under the judgment of the age to come.

There are a few general comments to make before we try to unravel Paul. First, the sharp distinction between orders and baptism made by Boyer, von Allmen, and Schlier can be discussed only after we see that it is alien to the original intention of the text, because the question of orders did not occur that early in the church's history. So naturally the text has nothing directly to say about that which did not exist

66. H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962), p. 130.

67. Riley, p. 19.

68. Albert Oepke, "ἡλικία," in Gerhard Kittel (ed.), Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), I, 785.

in its own day.

The question is not what the text says or does not say about the priesthood of women, or liturgical priesthood at all, but whether Paul's concept of Christian life after baptism would allow us now to ordain women. Does Paul expect life after baptism to reflect in some way the fact that in Christ there is neither male nor female? These three writers seem to imply that Paul's statement applies only to the process of becoming a member in the church and not to the later behavior of that membership, that it applies only to the ceremony; they do not see that baptism is constantly lived out in all Christian lives.

We cannot understand Paul in so limited a way. We cannot, in fact, wipe out distinctions for the moment of baptism and reimpose them after the ceremony is over. To do so makes the mere ceremony more universal than the Christian life itself, into which baptism is really only the entrance.

Baptism's power comes from its partaking of realities beyond itself--the reality of the past life without Christ and the new life in Christ. Everything that baptism is, it is because it marks the boundary between these two lives, reflecting the death of the one and the coming into being of the other. To claim that we enter a state in baptism that we are not intended to maintain for the rest of our lives is against sound doctrine. Everything received in baptism, including the removal of sexual distinctions in Christ, is carried in its full reality into holy orders, for conferring them does not make the priest a member of a different community than that of all baptized Christians, the body of Christ in whom there is neither male nor female. The realities of baptism form a basis for, not a contradiction of, the realities of all

other sacraments, including holy orders.

Second, one needs to ask Oepke if the split between this world and the world to come operates in Paul in quite the distinct fashion claimed. For Paul, is not the Christian community the expression of the present and coming rule of Christ, so that all the characteristics of the end time may begin to be seen in the church as she witnesses in the world to the truth which she has glimpsed but which is yet to come to its fullness? I am uncomfortable with including the church wholly within this fallen realm. For Paul, the church should be precisely the point where the spirit breaks through and judges all the worldly forms. Oepke is dangerously close to being a quietist in his interpretation, almost as if we should not approach perfection now if we had the chance because that is stealing God's prerogative.

The entire Letter to the Galatians is a tightly woven literary work that follows the rules of ancient rhetoric.⁶⁹ The three verses of particular concern to us are 3:26, 27, and 28.

For in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

These verses are set in an extended argument trying to show the Christian as the heir to Abraham, who, because "he believed in God" (3:6), is pictured as the type of those who are men of faith and therefore those who have been blessed with the blessing of God upon Abraham (3:9). Thus the passage 3:1-4:7 is concerned with showing the contrast between

69. Hans Dieter Betz, "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians," paper in School of Theology at Claremont Library vertical file.

reliance on law and reliance on faith, between the flesh and the spirit. Its object is to show that reliance upon the spirit is the true way.

Paul is arguing here against a position that sees circumcision at least, and perhaps the keeping of the entire Jewish law, as necessary for salvation. (5:2-12, 6:15) His counter-claim is that the reception of the Spirit in faith frees us from compulsory obedience to the law. (5:1) Therefore the context of verses 26-28 is not primarily a concern about baptism; rather it asks about the basis of the Christian life: is it in obedience to the law or in faith? Baptism is perceived as a means of entrance into Christ, that is, as a sign or means of entering the life in the Spirit of Christ. (3:27) In fact, verse 28 does not state that these three sets of opposites are irrelevant in the reception of baptism, but that in the life in the Spirit after baptism, when the baptized have become the heirs of Abraham's promise, the people of faith and the Spirit, then the distinctions no longer exist. This is not stating conditions for baptism, but only that because of baptism the baptized are heirs of Abraham. The relationship of heir to the promises of God becomes the primary identifying element, and not the distinctions of Jew-Greek, slave-free, male-female. These are primary elements in distinguishing people in the world, but not in Christ. That is, the overcoming of distinctions does not apply just to baptism, but to the whole life one enters on being baptized.

The general form of verse 28 is a denial of distinctions in Christ. This language is used two other places in Paul's letters, I Corinthians

70. Pierre Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates (Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1972), p. 79. Slaves and women possess all the rights and duties of other members of the community because all they are as Christians they derive from Christ. There is no more basic category for the Christian than ἐν Χριστῷ.

12:13f. and Colossians 3:11. Galatians 3:28 is the only place that the denial of male-female distinctions is mentioned. But there are enough similarities between this instance and the other two in Paul to make it reasonable that this language of the denial of distinctions was used in the early church as a form, more particularly, as a form in the baptismal liturgy.

There are a number of reasons for thinking this section a quotation from a baptismal liturgy. First, in both I Corinthians 12:13f. and Colossians 3:11 this language is associated with baptism. I Corinthians 12:13 emphasizes baptism as a means of making one, the same as Galatians 3:28. "For by one Spirit we were baptized into one body--Jew or Greek, slave or free--and all were made to drink of one Spirit." In Colossians 3:10 the author speaks of putting on the new nature. There seems to be an extended use of a baptismal metaphor in Colossians 2. (2:12, 2:20, 3:1) The main point here is not a discussion of baptism but the rejection of the elemental spirits, and, in Colossians 3, practical advice on the forms of Christian life after these spirits have been rejected. Therefore this language of putting on and off, or baptism into one body, the removal of distinctions, is always associated with baptism even when baptism is not the main point of the passages where the language is found.

Second, each of these fragments has a similar thematic structure.

- a. baptism in the one body or putting on Christ
- b. listing of the pairs of opposites that do not exist in Christ
- c. summary statement that in Christ all are one.

I Corinthians 12:13f. lists the pairs as follows: Jew-Greek, slave-free, in the same order as Galatians. Colossians 3:11 is slightly expanded but the same basic order is preserved; Jew-Greek distinctions are mentioned

first and slave-free distinctions second. This rather tight structural pattern points to some source outside Paul's letters.

Third, although the immediate context of each of these verses concerns baptism, yet baptism is not the specific concern of any of the larger units in which these verses are placed. In I Corinthians 12 Paul is trying to give a theological ground for dealing with the gifts of the Spirit. In Colossians 3:11 Paul is engaged in moral exhortation, painting a picture of what life is supposed to be like in the church. The form is being used for purposes of reminding people what has happened, and illustrating the state which they are supposed to fulfill now.

Fourth, Paul changes his form of address from the first person in Galatians 3:25 to the second person in verses 26 and 29. This change does not seem to fit easily in the context. Paul has been describing the function of law before the coming of faith, as applying to all Christians, including himself. He uses *we*, *ἡμεῖς*. After faith has come, "We are no longer under a custodian for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God through faith." (Galatians 3:25-26) The change is abrupt and I do not see any reason for it in the text. This does not prove anything, but it may indicate a joint in the text, where Paul has moved from direct address of all Christians to quoting a liturgy addressed by the officiant to the newly baptized.

The idea of putting on Christ, or putting on the new man, is associated with baptism. (Ephesians 4:22, Colossians 2:11, Colossians 3:9) The last mentioned text is important because the fact of having put on Christ in the past is made a justification for a special mode of present action: do not lie. Not all language associated with baptism points to the action of God in the future. Scholars think this

language of putting on and off refers to the custom of disrobing and dressing again after baptism which was a prominent part of the ceremony in the early church. The changing of clothes is important in many rites of passage.⁷¹ For these reasons most scholars believe Galatians 3:26-28 is part of a very early baptismal liturgy.⁷²

If this is part of a baptismal liturgy, then not only Paul but certain parts of the early church were using the denial-of-distinctions language in their common liturgical life, in the most important single event of their Christian lives except, perhaps, martyrdom. This language would have been common, at least in the pauline churches. In churches which are not self-consciously creedal, the liturgy is usually the most powerful carrier of meanings and shaper of group life. To discover in the liturgy, especially the baptismal liturgy, a denial of male and female distinctions in Christ is to discover it at the very heart of the meaning of these early Christians' lives. This logic destroys Boyer's position (see p. 65).

So whatever the meaning of this verse, it is the expression of a core belief of the early pauline churches. The problem is not to discover what Galatians 3:28 means in relation to I Corinthians 11:2-16 and I Corinthians 14:33b-36, but how the same man who asserts Galatians 3:28 can also assert the ideas of the Letter to the Corinthians.

The other implication of this passage's liturgical origin is that it is older than Paul's letter. How much older we do not know, but it does take us back beyond the stage of written documents. Galatians was

71. Wayne A. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," History of Religions, XIII:3 (1974), 185.

72. Ibid., p. 180.

probably composed in 53-54, so the liturgical use of this formula could be as early as the late 40's.

What does baptism mean in this passage? In the entire section of Galatians 2:8-4:6, the putting on and taking off metaphor is the vehicle for presenting the Christians' life and contrasting it with the old life. Paul obviously intends this language, and therefore the baptismal metaphor and act, to determine Christian style and action in the present. Anyone who wishes to postpone the results of baptism that determine the form of the community to some future age or world beyond this one, must justify himself in the face of Paul's express belief that the putting on of the new man, or Christ, determines the present form of Christian life. We are now one in Christ, says Paul, so that we need to try to discover what being neither male nor female may mean for the church now. This passage is probably an admonition at baptism or an explanation of the result of the experience of baptism directed toward the newly baptised. Paul certainly expected it to make a real difference in the present to those to whom it was directed.

In I Corinthians 12:12f. the point seems to be that baptism into one body where the Jew-Greek and slave-free distinctions are removed means that life is determined by gifts distributed according to the Spirit. The gifts of the Spirit have become basic for what happens in the church, and the categories of the world have been rejected as ruling categories. On this basis I do not see how Oepke can maintain that the removal-of-distinctions language can refer only to a future age and therefore does not call for present action. Paul's very form of language in Corinthians and Colossians calls for present action. The problem for Oepke in Galatians is compounded because entrance into the

state that the denial-of-distinctions language describes is noted by verb forms in the aorist, which point back to the putting on of Christ as having been the result or nature of baptism. The consequent lack of distinctions is therefore effective in the present as caused by past action.

It is true that Paul does not call for revolutionary action to realize the lack of Jew-Greek, slave-free, and male-female distinctions in Christ. That is not because such changes have been postponed to the future but because the decisive change has already occurred. The question is not over creating the change itself, but whether we as individuals, and our institutions, will accept that gift which Christ offers us of the freedom to order ourselves according to the Spirit
73
rather than according to the law.

We also need to beware of a certain time-conditionedness in interpreting this text. Paul had to fight for the idea that the Jew-Greek distinction made no difference to becoming a member of the church.
74
Not all agreed. (Acts 11:15:12) Today no one would question that the church is adamantly set against slavery--not only does it make no difference in heaven or the age to come but also it has no place on earth. But this passage was used in the debate about slavery during the first half of the nineteenth century to prove that because slaves and freemen were one in Christ, their objective status in this world

73. Gunther Bornkamm, Paul (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 188f. This is a discussion of Paul's ideas about baptism from which I have drawn most of my impressions about the pauline position.

74. Oscar Cullman, "Dissension Within the Early Church," in his New Testament Issues (New York: Harper & Row, 1970).

was irrelevant to Christianity. Let the interpreter beware.

But if Paul intended the language of unification to be realized in the church, how do we interpret his insistence on distinctions between men and women in other passages? First, Galatians 3:28 is highly generalized and theological. In it Paul develops a single strand of argument. It is therefore different from I Corinthians 11:2-16 and 14:33b-36 where we find instructions for the government of particular churches in particular situations. He is probably responding to concrete questions the Corinthians have asked him, not developing his theological thought in a sustained and unified way. Paul adduces many different reasons for the stand he takes in the Corinthian letters. So the passages from I Corinthians do not form a clearly-argued exposition of his fundamental position. He uses whatever arguments are at hand, and they are varied indeed. In Galatians Paul tries to show the general relation of the law with life in the Spirit. From this he will deduce what the behavior of the Galatians ought to be. In the Corinthian passages he is faced with particular problems that are destroying the order of services, and he responds to the particulars. Therefore Galatians records the general thrust of Paul's thinking--its philosophical articulation--more directly than the Corinthian passages. Any answers to questions dealing with the authority and distinctions within the church must be seen in the context of Galatians. Galatians, and not the Corinthian texts, shows us the basic pattern of Paul's thinking.

75. George D. Armstrong, Christian Doctrine of Slavery (New York: Scribner's, 1857), p. 65.

William Sumner Jenkins, Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South (Gloucester, Ma.: Smith, 1960), p. 203. This gives a general survey of the use of Biblical arguments to support slavery--chastening reading for any Biblical critic.

So in opposition to Boyer, I see the Galatian passage as more central precisely because it is located in a self-conscious theological discussion closely tied to the core of Paul's thinking, justification by grace through faith, and because it is developed in response to a general rejection of works as the basis for the community rather than in response to a concrete problem of veils or silence that in itself no longer concerns us. If we base our arguments on the general thrust of Paul, we go
76
to Galatians.

So this passage is concerned with the distinction between bondage under the law and that freedom in Christ of which baptism is a means or a sign. Baptism is introduced in Galatians because it is the sign that the categories which used to rule our lives are actually blotted out by Christ in the new life, and not just for the duration of the baptismal service. To become a son of God denotes a new mode and category of existence over against that of the world. As Krister Stendahl says:

This statement is directed against what we call the order of creation, and consequently it creates a tension with those Biblical passages--Pauline and non-Pauline--by which this order of creation maintains its place in the fundamental view of the New Testament concerning the subordination of women.⁷⁷

Now, what does Paul mean when he says that there is neither

Ἰουδαίος οὐδὲ Ἕλλη, οὐκ ἐν δούλῳ οὐδὲ ἐλευθερῷ, οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν
καὶ θήλει in Christ? The words ἄρσεν and θήλει are not the usual words for man and women. Probably they refer to the LXX version of Genesis 1:27 or 5:2, where the same very unusual neuter form is also used. ἄρσεν

76. This is the basic idea of Krister Stendahl, The Bible and the Role of Women (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966).

77. Stendahl, p. 32.

is the word for "male" that emphasizes sexuality. It is not personhood that is rejected here, but masculinity and femininity.

This is analogous to what happens in the other two pairs: it is the category and not the person who is blotted out. We know what Paul means when he says that there is neither Jew nor Greek in Christ. This language, very common in his epistles, states that pretensions to special consideration based for the Jew on his membership in the chosen people and for the Greek on his education must be given up. This is also true of the slave-free pair. One must give up any hope for special consideration based on these categories that do not come from Christ. The new life comes from the promise of God realized in Christ and not from the world. That is, this passage may simply mean that the social disabilities of being a woman do not apply in the church. Whatever else Paul meant, he meant at least that.

But there are other things to understand. First, there are many parallels in both ancient Greek and Hebrew literature to the removal-of-distinctions language. In many of these passages sexuality itself is seen as an evil, and the removal of distinctions is not a fulfillment of all human potential but a sloughing off of an imperfection. It is not the basic unity of human kind that is asserted but the basic evil of sexuality.

There are numerous examples. The Gospel of Thomas, logion 22 says:

Jesus said to them: When you make the two one, and make the inside like the outside, and the outside like the inside, and the upper side like the under side, and when you make the male and the female into a single one, so that the male will not be male

78. Walter Bauer, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 109.

and the female will (not) be female; . . . then you shall enter (the kingdom).⁷⁹

This literature points to the fact that in the Hellenistic world sexuality was despised and feared as opening one to irrational forces. The relations between men and women were seen as difficult and full of problems and dangers.⁸⁰ As the Corinthians say to Paul, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman." (I Corinthians 7:1) The dream of much Greek thought was to leave the sexual totally behind.⁸¹ For instance, Epicurus makes women equal to men in his philosophical school, but only at the price of exalting philia and suppressing eros. One could not attain ῥητορικία and be sexually active. Yet one woman, Leontion, served as the head of the Epicurean garden in rotating succession with men. For Epicurus the equality of men and women implies the abolition of all normal social roles. Musonius Rufus, the Roman Stoic, thought women should study philosophy, and wrote an essay, That Women too Should Study Philosophy. Like Cleanthes, he believed that because women had the same λογος as men, what was virtue for one was virtue for the other.⁸² Yet there is a tension between theory and practice. There are very few women philosophers even among those schools that grant them theoretical equality. The equality of women in philosophical theory was a result of the attempt to find a unifying principle in the universe.

79. "Gospel of Thomas," in Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1972), p. 520.

80. Hans Dieter Betz, "Galatians 3:28," Tape 779a, School of Theology Library, Claremont, California.

81. Meeks, pp. 172-3. I am indebted to Meeks' article for many of the examples from classical literature used in this section.

82. Max Pohlenz, Die Stoa (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1948-9), I, 137, 140, 315, 351 f.

It is therefore the solution to a philosophical problem, and the transition to seeing woman's status as an ethical and social question was not made. Musonius' disciple, Epictetus, had no time for women.

But in all this literature there is no affirmation of sexuality as good, and especially no affirmation of the exercise of procreation as good.

Is Paul then talking about there being neither male nor female as a rejection of sexuality, perhaps even to the extent of the Gnostics who rejected biological fact in an attempt to reach a non-sexual ultimate state? That would seem to run counter to his insistence that marriage is not a sin. (I Corinthians 7:36) Paul may believe celibacy to be better than marriage, but the very fact that marriage is permissible means any legalistic understanding of the overcoming of sexuality in Christ is impossible. We need to look elsewhere for a full understanding of Galatians 3:28. Paul prefers celibacy because marriage is distracting, not because it per se excludes one from life in Christ.

There is another use of language similar to Galatians 3:28 in antiquity. In Greek literature the famous "three reasons for gratitude" take various forms and are attributed either to Plato or to Thales. Diogenes Laertius 1:33 attributes them to Thales in the following form: "I am glad I was born a human and not a beast, a man and not a woman, a Greek and not a barbarian." Lactantius in his Divinae Institutionis attributes them to Plato, in the same order only adding: lastly that I⁸³ was an Athenian born in the time of Socrates." These two examples pick up the male-female and Greek-barbarian distinctions in a form almost like

83. Lactantius, "Divinae institutionis," in Ante-Nicene Christian Library (Buffalo: Christian Literature Co., 1886), VIII, 90.

Paul's, but not the slave-free distinction. But the slave-free distinction is found in an inscription from first century B.C. Philadelphia which grants "entrance to the house of Dionysius to men and women, free-
⁸⁴
 man and slave."

Apparently the ancient world, like the modern, was very much aware of the benefits given by a proper place in the hierarchy of position and power and, like the modern world, had an uneasy conscience about those benefits. One's place in this hierarchy determined who one was and what one could hope for. The categories that determined one's place--slave or free, man or woman, Greek or Jew--were controlled largely by fate. In Christian language, they were among the principalities and powers of this world. In general, people were willing to live within these given parameters, except in the case of some of the mystery religions.

The ancient viewpoint was that being a freeman, a male or a member of an "in" social group placed one in a state of blessedness. The opinion was present in Judaism also. From the Tannaim we read:

R. Judah says: "Three blessings one must say daily: blessed (art thou) who did not make me a gentile. Blessed (art thou) who did not make me a woman. Blessed (art thou) who did not make me a boor."⁸⁵

Some scholars see Galatians 3:28 as a direct response to this sort of language. In one case at least, the benedictions 2, 3, and 4 of the Shemoneh Ezreh, the elements occur in the same order as in Galatians
⁸⁶
 3:28. But it is hard to know whether Galatians 3:28 evolved in

84. Dittenberger, III, fragment 985.

85. Tosefta-Berakot 7: 18, Palestinian Talmud Berakot 9:2, and Babylonian Talmud Menahot 43b where "slave" is used in place of "boor." Boor here means an ignorant peasant who has neither the knowledge nor the resources or perhaps the desire to keep the Law of Moses.

86. J. M. Ford, "Biblical Material Relevant to the Ordination of Women,"

response to the presence of these ideas in Judaism or whether these ideas in Judaism evolved in response to Galatians 3:28. At any rate, both the Jewish and Greek literatures assert the primacy of the worldly orders that Paul's statement in Galatians pulls down.

I think we may now draw some general conclusions for the ordination of women. Galatians 3:28 neither restricts the priesthood to men nor offers it to women. But it implies that any such restriction or offering must come from the Spirit, and not the social structures of existence that rule the world. Since sexuality, male and female, is placed in a secondary position and seen as one of those structures that rules the world, the implication is that both men and women are free to do whatever they need to do to build up the community, to respond to the Spirit and to live out a life of faith. Galatians would judge all other methods of ordering church life as cursed under the law. To exclude women from the priesthood on the grounds of Biblical texts or church traditions that base themselves on male-female distinctions is a direct refusal to accept the new life in Christ and a turning back to the principalities and powers Christ overcame for us. On these grounds women priests are permissible to the community but not required of it, just as men priests are permissible but not required.

I Timothy 2:11-15

We have here an unequivocal statement that women should not speak in church. This passage is usually used in arguments of the following

Journal of Ecumenical Studies, X (1973), 688.

Kosmola, pp. 227-9.

Madeleine Boucher, "Some Unexplored Parallels to I Cor. 11, 11-12, and Galatians 3, 28: the New Testament on the Role of Women," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXI (1969), 53.

form: teaching is an essential function of the priesthood, no woman can teach in the church, therefore no woman can be a priest. Cardinal Daniélou is sometimes hard to pin down on this issue, but he does say

In effect it [this verse] implies that women must not belong to the ordained ministry strictly so called, to which belongs the privilege of presiding in the congregation, of teaching authoritatively, and of offering the Eucharist.⁸⁷

P. C. Spicq also points out:

If the arguments of the Apostle baffle the contemporary mentality, it occurs to us that it is necessary to assign each a place and a precise role in the official organization and that the very nature of woman destines her to the domestic hearth.

He then goes on to say that although many women have taught Christian doctrine and life, none has ever done so in the sanctuary.⁸⁸

Both of these gentlemen are formidable scholars. The decisive and negative position they assign to this passage makes it of first importance to determine whether or not they are right.

First, some general comments about the passage. In comparison with the passages from I Corinthians, we can see a movement away from freedom for women toward their repression. In I Corinthians Paul is concerned that the woman's active role in worship be identified and that her status of mutuality with men be seen and respected. He does not say in Corinthians that men and women are equal, but he does take considerable pains to establish their mutuality and the sorts of responsibility that go along with it. Chapter seven of I Corinthians is an especially good

87. Jean Daniélou, The Ministry of Women in the Early Church (New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1961), p. 10. For roughly the same opinion see L. Hick, Stellung des hl. Paulus zu Frau in Rahmen seinen Zeit (Cologne: Americanisch-Ungarischer Verlag, 1957), p. 181.

88. P. C. Spicq, Saint Paul: Les Épîtres Pastorales (Paris: Gabalda, 1947), pp. 71-2. See the appendix for my translation of the relevant parts of this work.

example of this, the concept of mutuality being a guiding idea in the literary construction of the chapter. But in I Timothy 2:11-15 there is no hint of this mutuality, there is no balance of responsibilities, and the command to silence is absolute.

This was part of a general movement in the late first and early second century church toward more strict structures. As the Dibelius-Conzelmann commentary puts it, "The Church must make adjustment for a prolonged stay in the world in the face of the evolution of both ortho-⁸⁹doxy and heresy within the Christian community." In the Pastoral Epistles, then, we see the formation of an ecclesiastical tradition that tries to create a style of living designed to help Christians avoid the pitfalls of excess asceticism and speculation, and also to begin to allow the exercise of some selectivity in choosing the officers of the community. The problem for the author of the pastorals is the establishment of a mode of life in the world, not the preparation of a community to⁹⁰ face its end. Therefore the church begins to accommodate itself to the world's cultural norms. This shift is expressed in the greater rigidity⁹¹ assigned to the position of women.

89. Martin Dibelius, The Pastoral Epistles (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), p. 8.

90. I personally do not accept Paul as the author of the Pastoral Epistles. To give one relevant example of the difficulties that must be overcome if one is to accept them as Paul's, consider Romans 5:12--"Sin came through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned." What does that have to do with I Timothy 2:14? It appears that some extreme interpretative legerdemain would be necessary to reconcile these two viewpoints. There are, of course, more standard arguments that appear to me conclusive, all of which are listed in the Dibelius-Conzelmann commentary.

91. Buhrig, p. 51.

It looks as if we have a slightly different question here than in the genuinely pauline passages. There we needed to be very careful to discover exactly what Paul meant. Here we have a definite statement, but is it valid for all time or only for its own?

I Timothy 2:11-15 contains material giving general moral regulations for women. The literary unit begins at verse 9 where there is an obvious break, moving from regulations strictly concerned with prayer to more general rules for women. The context within which the rules are being applied remains community worship, especially in verses 11 and 12. Verses 9 and 10 are concerned with physical adornment and its contrast with true adornment. Verses 11 and 12 have a parallel structure, verse 11 expressing what a woman should do and verse 12 what she should not do. Both verses are bracketed with the word meaning silence. Verses 13 and 14 provide the theological reason for the stance taken in verses 11 and 12. Verse 15 seems to answer the question, If woman is responsible for sin in a special way, how may she be saved? The last part of this verse is rather confusing and forms one of the critical problems in this passage. The general idea seems to be fairly plain: as woman sinned in a special way in the beginning, she will be saved in a special way--that is, by living out the result of the punishment God has placed upon her. (Genesis 3:16)

The structure looks like this:

Verse 11

- A. Woman a learner
- B. Woman to do so in subordination and silence. This is concerned with her deportment while she learns.

Verse 12

- A. Woman not to be a teacher. Negative analogue of 11A.
- B. Woman not to have authority over men. Negative analogue of 11B.

- C. Command to remain silent. Practical result of the application of the preceding principles.

Verse 13

Justification of the content of the command by the temporal priority of the creation of men.

- A. Adam created first,
- B. Eve created second

Verse 14

- A. Adam not seduced
- B. Eve seduced

Verses 13 and 14 are in parallel construction, Adam's situation being given first in each case, and then Eve's.

Verse 15

This does not seem to fit into the structure as tightly as the others do. There are two parts to the verse:

- A. Assertion that women will be saved in spite of their peculiar status with regard to sin
- B. Method of salvation
 1. Childbearing
 2. Continuing in faith, love and holiness with modesty

To appreciate the sense of this passage we must return to verse

8. The author's concern is that communal prayer be *χωρὺς ὀργῆς* *διαγογγισμού*, that is, without quarreling or anger. In verse 9 the *ὡσαύτως* indicates that the following regulations will instruct women how to pray in that fashion. One can understand easily how the display of superior wealth in ostentatious clothing or the untimely expression of knowledge could upset the community. These things still happen today. The factor uniting seemingly apparel, silence and not having authority over men is that all contribute to prayer without quarreling and anger. That is the reason for mentioning these regulations here, although the theological justification for them takes a different form.

In assessing the importance of this passage for today, we must remember the author's basic concern with order in the community. Prayer is a means of saving grace and coming to knowledge of truth (verse 4). It is not to be an occasion for dispute and argument. The author of this

letter sees one of the occasions for dispute as the expression of *ἀυθεντης* mentioned in verse 12. This word means to have dominion, to be an autocrat. So it is the expression of coming forward to challenge, or of autocratic authority in teaching, that is not permitted because it has become an occasion for conflict. Falconer suggests that women had⁹² been challenging the teaching in the middle of public worship. Note also that the text does not deny *ἐξουσια* to the woman, but this more specific sort of authority, autocratic authority, *ἀυθεντης*. This interpretation makes sense in the light of I Timothy 2:8, "without quarreling." Perhaps forbidding all speech to women was the only way to prevent *ἀυθεντης* in Timothy's situation. But we need to ask if we would achieve the end he desires by applying his solution, or whether, given the growing freedom of women in culture outside the church, we would not increase quarreling in the congregation by refusing women permission to speak inside the church. That is the danger of applying the author's words without considering his purpose.

Verses 9 and 10 develop the author's concept of Christian womanhood. She is to be modest, chaste, and prudent; for Paul's time these were the predominant feminine virtues. As the previous verse describes it, her true ornamentation is not external at all, but the good deeds of verse 10. The numerous parallels with non-Christian literature indicate that injunctions against braids, gold, pearls, expensive clothes and the injunctions to be silent and subordinate are all traditional material incorporated into the epistle.⁹³ The general principle of silence and

92. Sir Robert Falconer, "I Timothy 2:14-15. Interpretative Notes," Journal of Biblical Literature, LX (1941), 375-78.

93. Dibelius, p. 46, nos. 13 and 15.

subordination is applied to public worship to deal with inner-church conflict where the women are interrupting the teachers. The object is to restore order and avoid strife (verse 8).⁹⁴

One question is what is the precise meaning of *ἐπαταγή* in verse 11? It is the opposite of *ὑποεὐτυς* which means to prevail, dominate, rule autocratically. Dibelius mentions a passage from Philemon (fragment No. 132), "It is a good wife's duty, O Nikostrate, to be devoted to her husband, but in subordination, a wife who prevails is a great evil."⁹⁵

Authority in the RSV seems to imply a continually-exercised and officially-recognized right to power. I do not think the Greek means that here, but that the women should not in public worship act autocratically toward their husbands. There is a difference between prevailing in argument and exercising lawful authority.

Finally, there is the question of honesty. What sort of authority does this passage have for us? If we use it to oppose the priesting of women, we are also required to oppose wearing gold or pearls in church. Tertullian and other church fathers were more consistent on this point, and preached against the sartorial refinements of their congregations.⁹⁶ We have altered many customs urged by the Pastoral Epistles; for instance, in I Timothy 5:20 the public reprimand by ecclesiastical officers and in Titus 5:9 the injunction to slaves to obey their masters. If we pass beyond the text in our ideas about slavery, there is no reason why we may not do the same with our ideas about the proper role of women. Those who

94. Dibelius, p. 47.

95. Dibelius, p. 44.

96. See especially Tertullian's De cultu Feminarum and Chrysostom's sermons against luxury.

use the text as an argument against the ordination of women must present evidence that one part of it is authoritative while another part is not.

Verse 13⁹⁷ appeals to the ancient idea that the elder of two was the superior, and it is the heir to the Genesis statement that the male was created first. In fact, the Book of Genesis is ambiguous, the P account claiming that male and female were created at the same time and the J account making a point of the priority of the male in only one questionable interpretation of a verse. (Genesis 2:23b) In any case, Genesis does not make the masculine nature of the original human a claim of superiority but only uses it to illustrate the incompleteness of creation without woman. The author of the Pastorals here wrests the evidence, seeming to claim that his stance is drawn from an exegesis of Genesis, but it is one our critical understanding will not allow us to accept.

The word *ἑξαπατηθεῖσα*, to lead astray, verse 14, may refer to⁹⁸ a Jewish tradition that Eve was sexually seduced by the serpent. If something like this is not meant, how can it be said that Adam was not seduced? Our reading of Genesis seems to say that the man sinned along with the woman, and both were punished. But this idea of woman as the origin of sin was popular in Jewish literature

Woman is the origin of sin,
And through her we all die.
Sirach 25:24

Timothy explicitly denies that Adam was deceived. Some of the ancient exegetes distinguish between being deceived and sinning. Adam sinned,

97. Sanh. Berakot 38a, Genesis Rabba 8 (69). See also Strack and Billerbeck, III, 1645. Exodus R 21 (83rd) is an amusing example.

98. Genesis Rabba 18 on Genesis 2:23, Proto-Evangelium Jacob 13:1.

but Eve's subordination is not because of sin but because of the intellectual incapacity of women to detect deception.⁹⁹ St. Augustine champions this interpretation of Timothy 2:14, in the City of God, 14:11:

"The woman sinned at the serpent's persuasion, and the man at the woman's offer."¹⁰⁰

The typological value given Adam and Eve meant that in the ancient world, in both Christianity and Judaism, this sense of reliving in ourselves and our day the history of our first parents would militate against women priests. But it is a question whether we can accept the exposition of Genesis upon which these ideas are based. We would then, if consistent, prohibit women theologians as much as women priests.

The other criticism needing consideration is that the early church was of two minds about the meaning of the fall. We have one interpretation here in I Timothy, another in Romans 5 and 6. There Paul sees the fall as inclusive, in a primary sense, of the whole human race. This is the more original understanding of Genesis, where both the man and the woman fall and both are punished by God. If we are to base church policy on the understanding of woman's place in the fall, we cannot have it both ways.

Verse 15 refers back to Genesis 3:16. According to the author of I Timothy, the woman is saved by living out the restrictions God has placed upon her. This idea is present in the Greek world, e.g., in Xenophon's writing on the constitution of Sparta, 1:4, "The most noble

99. Spicq, p. 71. He gives numerous examples from the church fathers of this way of thinking. He interprets this text as reflecting a distinction between the persuasion to sin on the woman's part, and sin for the sake of affection toward his wife on Adam's part. The apologia for Adam is not very convincing; it sounds like a weasel.

100. A. Augustine, The City of God (New York: Modern Library, 1950), p. 462.

101

function of free women is to bring children into the world." One sees notions of the same sort in the Old Testament in the honorific phrase, "a mother in Israel," and in the honor that came to a woman with many sons, or the dishonor of being childless.

But there is a serious critical problem. God saves through Christ. For a woman to save herself through child bearing is a most blatant theology of salvation by works. It is at the very least extremely unpauline, since I Corinthians 7:1-17 sees marriage as a problem. Marriage, like other human institutions, needs to be christianized; merely being married and presumably having children is, in itself, not superior to any other state. One can no more be saved by marriage than by being a barber.

There are many ways of interpreting this verse: I prefer to see it in the context of I Timothy's polemic against Gnosticism. In II Timothy 3:6-7, he castigates women for their weakness for heresy. I Timothy 4:1-3 specifically says that these heretics forbid marriage. A similar idea is expressed in the Gospel of the Egyptians, quoted by Clement of Alexandria in Stromata 3.9.64. "How long will man continue to die? As long as women give birth." Irenaeus says the same thing in Adversus Haereses 1.24.2, when he speaks of Saturninus: "He says marriage and procreation are from Satan." Examples could be multiplied.

The author of I Timothy is, I believe, taking the more traditional Jewish point of view that childbearing is the special task of women and

101. Xenophon, On the Constitution of the Lacedaemonians (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 139.

102. Edgar Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963-65), I, 167.

103. Dibelius, p. 47.

using it polemically against his ascetical opponents. One of his weapons is to appeal to tradition against "new" ideas, and the sanctity of childbearing was part of the tradition.¹⁰⁴

But even the author seems to have been uncomfortable with his statement that woman is to be saved through childbearing, so he tacks a clause on the end of this verse, *ἐὰν μὲν ὦσιν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγαπῇ καὶ ἁγιασμῷ*, saying that salvation through childbearing has a limited effect and applies only to Christian women. A better translation to catch the sense might be: You will be saved while bearing children if you continue in faith, love and sanctification. That is, the states of bearing children and salvation are not mutually exclusive.

The last phrase, *μετὰ σωφροσύνης*, usually means moderation in sensual desires.¹⁰⁵ The implication is a further modification of the idea of salvation through childbearing: not only must the woman bear children but she must also fulfill the directions to submission and moderation found at other places in the Pastorals.

The same basic problems arise for those who wish to use this text against the ordination of women as arose in the case of I Corinthians 14:33b-36. The argument proves more than we want it to. It originally applied to laywomen, and to accept the sweeping commands for silence and submission among laywomen as now applicable is out of the question. The text does not say we are dealing with an ordained priesthood, but with all public teaching in the community. If this passage prohibits the ordination of women priests, it would also remove all women theologians,

104. Falconer, p. 377.

105. Falconer, pp. 377-78.

directors of religious education, and Sunday school teachers. To make a sharp distinction between teaching in church on Sunday morning and teaching in the world during the rest of the week is to violate what Eucharistic renewal strives for, the very sense of Christian worship being an offering of the real world to God. Women theologians lecturing in the University are doing the church's teaching as surely as the pastor on Sunday morning.

If the text's intention is to create order and decency in worship by preventing women from interrupting the preacher, this is no longer a danger in the Episcopal church, and in using the text in this debate we have raised a mountain of exclusiveness from the original molehill of over-enthusiastic women.

One of the cruxes for the use of this passage in the debate is how authoritative can a New Testament passage be that is based on an unacceptable understanding of the Old? The author made several assumptions about the interpretation of Genesis that are not obvious either in the text of Genesis itself or in our common sense. One is that the elder of two is almost necessarily the better. The second is that the original woman, and therefore all who are like her, are responsible in a special way for sin entering the world. If we reject these two interpretative conclusions, we are not justified in accepting as valid the reasoning that comes from them that limits women's participation in the church. Not even the most rigid theory of divine inspiration can save us here, because to assume inspired conclusions and a non-inspired reasoning process leading to those conclusions requires some sort of criterion to distinguish the inspired from the human; and the legitimate grounding of that criterion becomes as important for knowing truth as the fact of

inspiration. We are much better off simply to accept the fact that the author of I Timothy misunderstood Genesis and that his attempt to ground the subordination of women on universal Christian principle is a failure.

These interpretative conclusions are questionable for us in another way. If woman is responsible for sin in a way that dictates her subordination and prevents her priesthood, then she ought to be subordinate in all walks of life. As with most of the Biblical evidence, its universality is ignored. We cannot claim integrity for a position which takes a Biblical verse that says "all," and say that it really means "some," without giving a criterion for why it is this "some" rather than that "some" that is meant. Yet this is the form of logic employed in the negative arguments using I Timothy against the ordination of women.

The interpretation of Genesis ignores the fact that God censured both the man and the woman, and does not see that Genesis 3 gives no indication that the disobedience of the woman is more reprehensible than the disobedience of the man. It ignores Romans 5 and 6. It also threatens to drive a wedge into the human race between men and women so that they almost become different sorts of beings and the sense of unity in Christ is lost.

The authority of this text comes from the tradition of the church in which it has been used for years to determine the position of women. But the very question we seek to examine now is whether that tradition continues to be binding. Therefore it is impossible to appeal to the tradition itself as proof of its own right to continue as decisive. This is especially so in this case where the root of the tradition, the text itself, does not really concern itself with the ordination of women at all (contra Daniélou).

Spicq's idea that this text reflects a sort of natural division of labor between men and women has a certain truth to it. But we need to remember that the basic concerns of the author of I Timothy are order in the church and the defense of marriage against heretical Gnostics. I do not see how commanding women to keep silent now, and consequently the impossibility of making one of them a priest, would achieve either of those ends. Spicq has cut the application of this verse loose from its original purpose, and that is a dangerous undertaking.

Another way to put this is to ask if women priests would lead to more *ἀσθενείας* in the church, and consequently more disorder, be it physical or spiritual. But there is a counter question: is not the presence of *ἀσθενείας* a sign of a deeper disease, a misunderstanding of the nature of the Christian community as one in Christ, with its nature and the distribution of tasks determined by the Spirit in accordance with Christ? *ἀσθενείας* may arise in a community because the call of the Spirit is in conflict with the expectations of the community. We cannot settle the question one way or another using this verse as evidence.

CHAPTER V

THE PATRISTIC EVIDENCE

If we accept as authoritative the total crystallized structure of patristic thought as we now possess it, then we are bound to deny the office of priest to women. But to accept patristic evidence without enquiring into the problems and presuppositions from which this literature arose is to misunderstand its very nature. The patristic period was not a time of smooth development of doctrinal structures with well-honed edges and polished surfaces. The fathers did not, for the most part, write systematic treatises which examined a subject from all angles in a dispassionate spirit. Most of their writings were in response to pressing problems in the lives of their several churches; their theology was a responsive theology, immensely practical and shaped by the conditions and needs of special times and concrete places. To ignore this in our use of patristic evidence means to look for finality where none is present, to see in the fallible and time-conditioned responses of church people fighting to discover God's will an already complete and adequate expression of that will. Not all theological statements studied by church historians become the traditions of the church.

But the patristic period still contains our roots. It also contains in its literature ideas that are not fully articulated there. Patristic thinkers do not follow all their own suggestions to their logical conclusions. So we need to ask, "What are the basic directions implied in the patristic perceptions about what woman is and what the priesthood is, and what are the outcomes of these perceptions for the ordination of women?" "Does our position today grapple not only with what the fathers say, but also with why they said it and what the implications are that they do not say?" We may then discover more about the truth than if we merely proof-text from the fathers. Historical theology is a creative enterprise, hopefully fostering understanding between the different parts of the body of Christ scattered throughout space and time. To use the evidence provided by other parts of the body as if it had nothing more to do than answer our concerns is not to take those other parts very seriously. Historical theology must face its responsibility to balance the voice of the Spirit, tradition, reason and the Bible and avoid the unthinking importation of past opinions into the present. That is a form of intellectual grave-robbing, the result of which is a church full of dead ideas and short on living truth.

With this basic understanding of how the fathers are to be used, I need also to ask why those few fathers who reject outright the possibility of women priests do so, and what implications the origins of these rejections have for us. After all, the fathers who reject outright the idea of women priests are relatively few and mostly not the more important ones.

Epiphanius of Salamis writes the longest continuous essay on the topic, Tertullian and Ambrosiaster have considerable material in a much

more disorganized state, there are relevant passages in the Didascalia Apostolorum and passing mention in Augustine, Origen, and Chrysostom. But mostly these passages are infrequent and unimportant in a man's total thought. The question of the ordination of women is never considered abstractly, but always in the context of the refutation of some heresy or of moral exhortation to women to keep their proper place not only in the work of the church but also in society at large.

The fact that there is no systematic consideration or dogmatic presentation of the question on its own merits during the patristic period has some importance. It might even be argued that there is not, in fact, a tradition against the ordination of women but only a habit of not doing it. Most of the discussions that appeal to tradition do not trouble themselves to state a method for telling the difference between genuinely authoritative church teachings and convenient but not binding old habits. I will use the word "tradition" for convenience's sake, but consider the question open.

The tradition against the ordination of women was formed during the patristic period. If we can find out why women were excluded from ordination in the early church we have some idea whether that tradition should be honored by us now.

My claim is that patristic literature has within itself an instability that points toward the possibility of the ordination of women. At any rate, in dealing with the tradition against the ordination of women we need to remember that, until recently, this tradition has been mostly negative and not discussed, rather than positively asserted and debated. The church, rather than reaching some conclusions through specifically asking the question and allowing controversy to take its

course, has simply refrained from the ordination of women, no questions asked, no answers given. As tradition, the non-ordination of women is universal, but extremely weak.

Several cautions need to be mentioned to help us understand the patristic evidence. First, we need to ask whether tradition consists merely of the written documents that have come down to us. There is some evidence that the practice of the church was much freer than the written wishes of the fathers. Inscriptions on tombs, catacomb art, and the decrees of various councils give us a slightly different picture than the literary evidence, and one that has been explored in a very meagre fashion. My small investigations hint that the evidence is exceedingly complex and probably not finally conclusive, but it does seem to point toward a larger role for women, especially in the very early church, than one finds, say, in the fourth century. I find very little discussion of this sort of evidence in any of the writings in my bibliography.

Another caution is against arguments from silence. Even though we have actively studied patristic writings for centuries we still know relatively little about the common life of the second and third-century church. We need to be careful that we do not assume that the lack of mention of a practice means that it did not exist. Women priests were not common, but it is not quite honest to say that there were none, when we really do not know. Many people, even scholars, make the unjustified jump from lack of mention in the available literature to lack of presence in historical fact.

Along with this caution I place one against using old polemical ideas about the early church that will not stand the test of modern

scholarship. I refer especially to two that need to be discussed.

1. Jesus founded a three-fold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons which has not changed in its essential nature from its beginning until the present. 2. The conceptions of priesthood held in the patristic period were unified throughout the temporal and geographical extent of Christianity in the ancient world. An adequate discussion of these is another book, but I think I ought to at least indicate the grounds for my rejection of them as serious propositions.

The usual way of stating the first proposition is that there is a direct succession from Christ to the original apostles to the bishops. This rests on very shaky historical ground.

If one does no violence to the gospel texts, they do not allow us to assert nor even to suppose that Jesus, in his earthly life, gave to the twelve this title of apostle or one proper to themselves.¹

According to the pastoral epistles, faithful transmission of the faith is insured by a "line of succession" that operates among the witnesses sent to preach the gospel. Nothing in the pastoral epistles, however, allows us to say that it is through ordination or consecration that these witnesses undertake to fulfill their ministry as the apostles fulfilled it. One might well assume this, but the point is that neither Christ nor his apostles expressly and definitely fixed the forms, the structure, and the limits of this ministry. The New Testament does not provide us with a ministerial set up that has precise institutional form.²

Finally, Küng lists three things missing in the pauline churches usually thought to be essential in the church's ministry and the lack of which points to a great deal more flexibility in the forms of ministry in the early church than the theory of Christ's particular institution of

1. Beda Rigaux, "Apostolic Succession: Rethinking a Barrier to Unity," in Hans Küng (ed.), Concilium No. 34 (New York: Paulist Press, 1968), pp. 7-8. He is quoting J. Dupont.

2. Bernard Dupuy, "Is There a Dogmatic Distinction between the Function of Priests and the Function of Bishops?" in Küng, p. 80.

them can tolerate. 1. There was no monarchical episcopate in the pauline communities. 2. There was no office of presbyter in the pauline communities. 3. There is no mention of ordination or the laying on of hands in the pauline communities.³ If one takes the trouble to follow through the historical work Küng has done, it seems conclusive. The offices of bishop, priest, and deacon are historical creations of the church.

In relation to the second question, even a very cursory examination of the texts shows that Chrysostom's notion of priesthood was different from Paul's and different from ours. With Jesus the minister was designated a servant, with Chrysostom the minister must exercise authority over others. Paul's communities had no "priests" as such, at least the word is never used and there is no indication of a special sacramental office where one person has a key position in celebrating the Eucharist. Such texts simply do not exist. By Chrysostom's time the notion was already beginning to appear that the priest was a special holy man who celebrated the sacraments for the people, a most unpauline notion. Examples could be multiplied, but the fundamental fact is that it smacks too much of magic to have something like the church's orders of ministry, which are both theological and sociological realities, come down through the ages unchanged. The fact is that God's call may be unchanged, but the means by which the communities that hear are organized to respond to that call have the changefulness of all mortal things.

3. Hans Küng, The Church (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), p. 402. Here and in other places Küng piles up a mountain of evidence that the New Testament ministries were quite different from ours, and that ours evolved in the course of the church's history to deal with new historical situations. See, for instance, his discussion of the word "priest," pp. 364-366 and his comments on ordination, p. 406.

There is also the question we have already hinted at, is the non-ordination of women really a tradition? The assertion of the unity of God does seem to qualify as a strong tradition in the church, it is positively attested to everywhere and is unanimously asserted in Christian thought. The notion that women should not be ordained has seldom been discussed. Its status as a tradition is attested by lack of discussion and practice. Therefore it can hardly be in the same class as the assertion that God is one.⁴ In the Roman church there used to be a tradition against saying the Mass in the vernacular. But this was perceived to be not binding. The same was true of the celibacy of clergy at the time of the Reformation; allowing them to marry was a fundamental change in practice as important as the ordination of women. We must be careful not to allow the fact that no (or few) women have been ordained priests to be transferred into the realm of binding tradition, at least without asking if the present evidence warrants that conclusion.⁵

Finally, we are not to be blindly obedient to tradition lest we discover we have substituted the past of the church for the will of God. What are the theological and philosophical assumptions behind the tradition of an exclusively male priesthood? Do the fathers give us any teachings about why women are either prohibited or permitted priestly functions? Are these reasons and presuppositions still valid today? Is

4. The Vincentian Canon is irrelevant in this case. Besides the fact that it has, of itself, no real authority in the Episcopal church, it is begging the question. Is the ordination of women a change in fundamental doctrine or practice, or is it merely a matter of discipline that can be settled locally as local needs dictate? One must prove that the ordination of women is a fundamental and radical theological change before the Vincentian Canon has even a chance of being relevant.

5. G. W. H. Lampe, "Church Tradition and the Ordination of Women," Expository Times LXXVI:4 (1965), 123. An excellent and full discussion of this point.

the tradition on these points self-consistent or are there tensions and disagreements among the fathers under the cover of what has been presented as the universal tradition of the church against the ordination of women? All these questions need answering, and I cannot do that; what follows is my attempt to line out some major areas and figures and offer some hints for future work.

Clement of Alexandria ca. 150-215

Clement, the first head of the catechetical school at Alexandria from whom we possess any substantial works, was a contemporary of Tertullian and represents the urban and educated Christianity that developed in Alexandria. He is important because he is one of the first Christian thinkers to attempt a self-conscious theology dealing with the place of woman.

The key text for understanding Clement's thought on the position of women in the church is Paidagogus 1.4.10-11.⁶

Let us recognize, too, that both men and women practice the same sort of virtue. Surely, if there is but one God for both, then there is but one Educator for both.

One church, one virtue, one modesty, a common food, wedlock in common, breath, sight, hearing, knowledge, hope, obedience, love, all alike (in man and woman). They who possess life in common, grace in common, and salvation in common have also virtue in common and, therefore, education too. The Scripture says: "for in this world, they marry and are given in marriage," for this world is the only place where the female is distinguished from the male, "but in that other world, no longer." There, the rewards of this life, lived in the holy union of wedlock, await not man or woman as such, but the human person, freed from the lust that in this life had made it either male or female.

Paragraph 11 then lists examples where one word refers to both the male and female members of a class, starting with mankind.

6. Clement of Alexandria, "Paidagogus," in Bernard M. Peebles (ed.), The Fathers of the Christian Church (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1954), XXIII.

This notion is basically Stoic. ~~TRUDELO~~ or 'education' sets one free from this world and forms the principle of unity between man and woman. People are to be educated for virtue, and as the good is the same in both a man and a woman, the education that leads to that good is also common to both. Education, for Clement, is more than factual knowledge, but includes the entire field of all that pertains to growth toward God. In effect, this passage radically equalized the position of women and men in the church.

Now this passage does not say that women may be priests. Indeed, there is a hint of discomfort with sexuality in the last line of the quote, referring to the 'lust' that in this life makes one male or female. In this discomfort with sexuality Clement is at one with almost all the ancient world. But he does assert one point of fundamental importance in the Christian tradition, that our relation with God, whatever form it takes, is fundamentally a human relation and is describable in terms common to the whole race. According to Clement, both masculinity and femininity are the results of a lustful state. In a positive vein, the human person is more basic than sexuality, and the communion of human persons breaks through the distinctions sexuality imposes. Grace, virtue, and salvation are common to both man and woman.

The context of this passage is Clement's asking of a fundamental question, "Is the one Christ a suitable guide for both halves of the human race?" His answer is based on the idea that God is one, and therefore the same sort of virtue pleases him in women as in men. Therefore, Christ is an adequate model for salvation for both men and women.

It is precisely because there are not two educators, one for men and one for women, that Clement asserts in the most unqualified terms the

essential unity of the human race as more fundamental than sexual distinction. Our unity across the dividing line of masculine and feminine is derived from Christ through his being the adequate model for virtue in both sexes. Notice also that he opposes the rather common ancient Gnostic idea that the process of salvation is one of having women become masculine. Clement states that in the next world there is neither male nor female, but the human person freed completely from sexuality.

This rejection of male-female sexuality in Clement seems to be tied to a rejection of passion.⁷ In the best Stoic tradition only those are free who are free of passions. Somehow the gratification of the body interferes with gaining knowledge of God. "To attain the knowledge of God is impossible for those who are still under the control of their passions."⁸ Notice that passion here is a human and not a strictly feminine trait.

This analysis is strengthened because in Stromata 3.11.71 the rational exercise of sexuality is not condemned, but the passionate is. In common with the rest of the church, Clement sometimes used woman as a symbol for passion, as in Stromata 3.4.63-67, where he carefully distinguishes the symbolic from the real. But this metaphorical usage of the word "woman" does not negate the basic sense of equality before God that seems to be the core of his theological ideas.

Someone needs to investigate the apparently anti-woman passages in the fathers, including Clement, to see to what extent it is real women

7. Clement of Alexandria, "Stromata," in J. E. L. Oulton and Henry Chadwick (eds.), Alexandrine Christianity (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), Stromata 3.5.42. All future references to the Stromata will be to this edition.

8. Stromata, 3.5.43, cf. 3.8.58.

who are the target of their condemnatory language, to what extent it is a result of using women as a symbol of passion, and to what extent the fathers fail to make a distinction.

Clement, of course, does place upon women the classic restrictions against such luxuries as soft clothes, jewelry, and makeup. The contrast that is constantly drawn is between the sober behavior of a Christian woman and the flauntingly self-assertive behavior of a pagan or heretic. One needs to ask how much Clement comes to these restrictions out of a culturally-imposed sense of woman's weakness, how much from the consciousness that norms of some sort must be established for the Christian community against the prevailing looseness of life in Alexandria, and how much is fundamentally derived from Christian theology. I sometimes feel that the fathers of the church were not above using any weapon at hand in their fights with heresy and immorality. If notions about the place of women would advance the battle, they would be used, even if they opposed other aspects of the father's own thought about broader questions like the identity of the mode of relation between men and God and women and God.

Yet in a passage against luxury and self-indulgence, Clement says that men have the stronger natures. (Paidagogus 3.17-19) I cannot resist the conclusion that Clement did not carefully think out all his references to women; it would be surprising if he had. What is important is that the passage asserting that man and woman have the same virtue and that humanity is more fundamental than sexual distinction, is specifically addressed to answering a question about the meaning of sexual distinctions

9. Martiniano Roncaglia, Histoire de L'Eglise Copte (Beyrouth: Dar al-Kalima, 1966), Tome III, 125.

in a person's relation to God, while the passages that assume some subordination mention it in passing, the primary concern of the text being elsewhere.

So at the very beginning of the Christian theological tradition we find an unequivocal assertion of the equality of men and women in their relationship to God. This throws into question any argument against women priests that is not based on cultural conditions, because the lack of ability to be a priest would certainly denote a qualitatively different relation to God.

I cannot resist the temptation to bring Clement's thought to bear on some of the ideas used to oppose the ordination of women now, especially those that have to do with the necessity of the Christ symbol being a male. Clement, obviously, would not say the things I say, but his general thought implies them. Any one like von Allmen, who sees God relating himself to men and women in fundamentally different ways, is not in the same Christian tradition as Clement. For Clement, it is precisely the unity of mankind on its most fundamental level, this lack of distinction between the sexes, that allows Christ's witness to both to be effective. Clement's views are also interesting if one stresses the priest as the symbolic host at a foretaste of the heavenly banquet; according to him this role, as partaking of the heavenly nature, ought to be completely beyond sex. If the priest is a mediator located at the point of intersection between this world and the next, he is at the precise point where sexuality becomes irrelevant or even non-existent. In each case, so far as the priest is necessarily male, he is operating from a strictly this-worldly perspective. No theology of priesthood which bases itself on the masculine symbolism for God, the masculinity of the

incarnate Christ and the consequent necessary masculinity of their
 representatives, the priests, can find a shred of support in Clement.¹⁰
 In so far as Clement represents the Christian tradition of the non-
 masculine and non-feminine nature of heaven and God, these arguments are
 not universal Christian tradition. His thought implies their denial.

Didascalia Apostolorum ca. 200-250

The Didascalia is a third century document coming down to us principally in a Syriac version. It represents the rural or small-city Christianity of Syria and North Palestine. It is therefore more concerned with its relations to Judaism than were the Christians of Alexandria, who at least had the option of Greek education. For instance, the Christianity of the Didascalia is closer to Jewish practice concerning marriage than the Alexandrines. It contains mainly practical regulations for church life on a day-to-day basis and might be called an early pastoral manual for bishops. It instructs them and their congregations on proper behavior and form in church government, morals, devotional practices and customs. It has considerable material on the relative positions of men and women, and a whole chapter (3) devoted to the general behavior of women. Interestingly, there is no mention of virgins, and early marriage seems to be assumed; correspondingly the concept of virginity does not influence the position of women in this church.¹¹

10. Even the assumption that the priest really represents the resurrected Christ presently active among us can not be used to call for a masculine priesthood if one accepts Clement's position. The resurrected Christ is also beyond sexuality because he is the representative among us of that other realm that we are to realize in ourselves where, as we have seen, Clement makes plain that sexuality at the least becomes irrelevant.

11. It would be interesting to use the position of Rosemary Reuther that the concept of virginity was the key to understanding the position of

The Didascalia has a long section in chapter 15 on widows, how they are to be governed and what their duties are:

For a widow should have no other care save to be praying for those who give, and for the whole church. And when she is asked a question by anyone, let her not straightway give an answer, except only concerning righteousness and faith in God; but let her send them that desire to be instructed to the rulers. And to those who question let them (the widows) make answer only in refutation of idols and concerning the unity of God. But concerning punishment and reward, and the kingdom of the name of Christ, and His dispensation, neither a widow or a layman ought to speak; for when they speak without the knowledge of doctrine, they will bring blasphemy upon the word. For our Lord likened the word of His tidings to mustard; but mustard, unless it be skillfully tempered, is bitter and sharp to those who use it. Wherefore our Lord said in the Gospel, to widows and to all the laity: Cast not your pearls before swine, lest they trample upon them and turn against you and rend you. For when the Gentiles who are being instructed hear the word of God not fittingly spoken, as it ought to be, unto edification of eternal life--and all the more in that it is spoken to them by a woman; How that our Lord clothed Himself in a body, and concerning the passion of Christ; they will mock and scoff, instead of applauding the word of doctrine; and she shall incur a heavy burden of judgement for sin.

iii.6 It is neither right nor necessary therefore that women should be teachers, and especially concerning the name of Christ and the redemption of His passion.

12
Didascalia 15.3.5-6

This passage gives two specific reasons why women are excluded from teaching. First, it is assumed that she lacks the education to deal with the more complicated doctrinal matters, "punishment and reward, the kingdom of the name of Christ and his dispensation." This unskillful presentation will hurt the church, for when pagans hear the doctrine presented without educated backing they will not believe. The implication is

women in the early church and the evidence she adduces to determine if, in fact, the position of women in churches which placed a high value on virginity and those, like this one, that did not, was much different. See Rosemary Reuther, "Virginal Feminism and the Fathers of the Church," in R. Reuther (ed.), Religion and Sexism (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1974).

12. Didascalia Apostolorum, tr. and ed. R. Hugh Connolly (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929). All future references to the Didascalia will be to this version.

that then the woman will be held responsible for the loss of the pagan's soul. This theme of the responsibility of teaching so as to convince the hearer of the truth of Christian doctrine is a favorite one in the early church and shows up again as a reason for the non-ordination of women in Chrysostom.

13

Notice that the same prohibition applies to the laity; it is not just a case of all women against all men, for laymen have exactly the same disadvantages as a woman in regard to lack of theological education. But since the heathen apparently scoff especially at women, it is women's inferior social position in non-Christian society that determines her rights inside the church. Note that today this situation has changed somewhat. Ostensibly, society is more open to women in positions of authority than the church is; women teachers are no longer scoffed at, at least openly, and the church accepts the equality of women as theologians competent to describe and defend the faith. For us, this reason for the exclusion of women is no longer valid. We have then, initially, two reasons against the teaching authority being given to women: they lack the education to give a sound account of doctrine, and their social position means that their teaching will injure the reputation of the church. Both these are no longer true.

But this same passage goes on:

For you have not been appointed to this, O women, and especially widows, that you should teach, but that you should pray and entreat the Lord God. For He, the Lord God, Jesus Christ our Teacher, sent us the Twelve to instruct the People and the Gentiles; and there were with us women disciples, Mary Magdalene and Mary the daughter of James and the other Mary; but He did not send them to instruct the people with us. For if it were required that

13. See my references to Chrysostom, pp. 135-137 and also p. 31.

women should teach our Master Himself would have commanded these to give instruction with us. But let a widow know that she is the altar of God; and let her sit ever at home, and not stray or run about among the houses of the faithful to receive. For the altar of God never strays or runs about anywhere, but is fixed in one place.

(15.3.6)

This passage moves from sociological and practical reasons to reasons grounded on the practice and command of Christ. If Jesus had wanted women to teach he would have appointed them to do so. One runs into this argument frequently on the popular level even today. We will discuss it elsewhere. This passage reflects the typical, basically static, picture of the world found in ancient legal documents where the law given by the god reflects the universal structure of things and is therefore unchanging. The practice of the church must mirror the practice of Jesus, in both what he did and did not do. The command of Jesus thus either creates or defines an eternal situation to which we must conform. Since the church today can by no stretch of the imagination claim Christly precedent for most of its patterns of behavior--mimeographs, pews, service books--we can hardly use arguments whose foundation is a strict imitation of Christ in all ways.

No account is taken of the possibility that women could get enough education to defend the faith with the skill of men, or that society could change to the point where opponents would not scoff at a woman's words simply because she was a woman. But this author was trying to regulate a difficult area of confusion in his own church in his own time and place. It is somewhat unreasonable to expect him to take account of all the possibilities the future might hold. It is our failure to be historical, and not his, when we take regulations determined in the third-century Syrian church and use them without considering their context to

create policy in twentieth-century America.

Apparently the main concern of the author was that widows were running about, gossiping, complaining that the share of alms distributed to them was too small, and in general disturbing the peace of the church.¹³ He therefore outlines a role for them that is in line with the social presuppositions about the appropriate position of women for his own time. They are to stay home, to pray. His prohibition on teaching would at least have the effect of bringing the "christian education" of the town more directly under the control of the bishop. In fact, I would speculate that a good many of the restrictions of the Didascalia are aimed at consolidating the bishop's position. As women church workers would not now be in competition with the bishop for power, we are not concerned with this problem in precisely the same way the Didascalia was.

What precisely is meant by the widow being the altar of God escapes me. Other times this phrase is quoted it has distinct overtones of mediatorship, since the altar is that upon which sacrifice is offered which therefore makes possible the expression of worship. I wonder if the church support given to the widows is not seen as a form of liturgical sacrifice, unbloody and charitable. The widows are one of the means the community has of formally showing its generosity and compliance with Christian action. Therefore in a sense the widows would be a living altar as the means by which the community exhibits its faithfulness. The Didascalia is not the only place where this imagery of the altar is used for widows; Polycarp mentions it in his Letter to the Philippians, 4:3.¹⁴ The

13. Didascalia Apostolorum, pp. xlii-xliii.

14. "The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians," in Kirsopp Lake (ed.), The Apostolic Fathers (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1949), I, 289.

whole question could stand to be worked out sometime.

That a woman should baptize, or that one should be baptized by a woman, we do not counsel, for it is a transgression of the commandment, and a great peril to her who baptizes and to him who is baptized. For if it were lawful to be baptized by a woman, our Lord and Teacher Himself would have been baptized by Mary his Mother, whereas he was baptized by John, like others of the people. Do not therefore imperil yourselves, brethren and sisters, by acting beside the law of the Gospel.

Didascalia 15.3.9

This passage is full of mysteries. What commandment does baptism by a woman violate? Why is Mary a more natural person to baptize Jesus than John? I have only one hint: in the Didascalia, baptism is an exercise of authority or pre-eminence. If woman is not pre-eminent somehow then it is natural that she would not baptize. The lesser or subordinate cannot mediate power to the greater. I know of no positive commandment in the Bible that women not baptize, and the text certainly indicates a positive prohibition. But perhaps we see here again both the idea that the church must mirror the acts of Christ and also must refrain from what he refrains from. Notice that the implication is that women do, in fact, baptize, and that this author wants to put a stop to it.

Notice an interesting logical flaw in the argument. Strictly speaking, it would be true that Jesus would be baptized by his mother only if it were necessary for Him to be so, not just possible. The great respect shown to Mary here does not prove that if women could baptize, Mary would be the only person who should baptize Jesus.

"The bishop is in the place of the Father, the deacon of the Son and the deaconess in the place of the Holy Spirit." Didascalia 9.2.27

This well developed mirroring of the heavenly hierarchy by the earthly one is another example of the way the author of the Didascalia

connects the earthly and divine realms. Incidentally, it gives us some information on the position of women.

And the deaconess shall be honored by you in the place of the Holy Spirit; and the presbyters shall be to you in the likeness of the Apostles; and the orphans and widows shall be reckoned by you in the likeness of the altar.

Didascalia 9.2.27

This shows the danger of assuming that the orders of ministry have been constant from the beginning. Here the presbyters are ranked lower than the deacons and deaconesses. At the time of the Didascalia the deacon was the chief liturgical officer after the bishop, and the pres-¹⁵byters were a sort of glorified vestry. This changed in the fourth century, but in third-century Syria the deaconess outranked the order of ministry that later developed into today's priesthood.

This is also an example of the use of feminine imagery in connection with God, as is Aphraates' *Demonstratio* 18:10: "A man who is yet¹⁶ unmarried loves and honors God his father and the Holy Spirit his mother." This aspect of the Holy Spirit as feminine needs more investigation. It is rather common in the East, perhaps because the word for spirit is feminine in both Aramaic and Hebrew, which is significant in the face of all the language one has heard from some bishops about the Christian tradition having only masculine images for God. This is simply not true, and represents the ignorant assumption that one knows the tradition when, indeed, one does not.

For me, the most important part of the Didascalia is the last chapter. Here the author points in a systematic way toward overcoming the

15. Didascalia Apostolorum, p. xxxix.

16. Aphraates, "Adversus Iudaeas de Virginitate et Sanctitate," Demonstratio 18:10, in R. Graffin (ed.), *Patrologia Syriaca* (Paris: Didot, 1894), Part I, Vol. I, c.839.

theology of the subordination of women. In an argument too long to quote completely, he chastises those who feel it necessary to keep the entire mosaic law, including those sections which exclude women from worship during menstruation. The general ground for this position is that the Holy Spirit was given them at baptism, so to refrain worship during menstruation either denies the lasting power of baptism or contradicts their own possession of the Spirit.

For if thou think, O woman, that in the seven days of thy flux thou art void of the Holy Spirit; if thou die in those days, thou wilt depart empty and without hope. But if the Holy Spirit is always in thee, without (just) impediment dost thou keep thyself from prayer and from the Scriptures and from the Eucharist. For consider and see, that prayer also is heard through the Holy Spirit, and the Eucharist through the Holy Spirit is accepted and sanctified, and the scriptures are the words of the Holy Spirit and are holy. For if the Holy Spirit is in thee, why dost thou keep thyself from approaching to the works of the Holy Spirit? as those who say: Whosoever sweareth by the altar, sinneth not; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it sinneth. As our Lord said: fools and blind, whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifies the gift: Every one therefore that sweareth by the altar sweareth by it, and by all that is upon it. And everyone that sweareth by the temple, sweareth by it and by Him that dwelleth in it. And everyone that sweareth by Heaven, sweareth by the throne of God and by Him that sitteth thereon." If therefore thou possess the Holy Spirit, but keep thyself from His fruits so that thou approach not to them, thou also shalt hear from our Lord Jesus: "Fool and blind, whether is greater, the bread or the Spirit that (sanctifieth the bread? Therefore if the Holy Spirit) thou possessest: fool, thou keepest vain observances.

Didascalia 26.6.2

This passage runs counter to much legislation in the eastern and early-medieval western church. So far as I know, it is not mentioned in the canonical commentaries of the later canonists or fathers. Not only does it militate against any notion that the priesthood should be closed to women because of uncleanness, a standard Orthodox view, but it also states in a fairly clear fashion that women possess the Spirit and the Spirit's gifts. The author did not draw the conclusion that the

Spiritual gift of ordination should be open to women, but if this argument is part of the tradition it is hard to see how we may escape that conclusion. Here again women are denied priesthood, but the reasons for this vary and there are basic theological currents flowing in the other direction.

In the Didascalia the reasons given against the priesting of women are lack of education, social inferiority, and a legalistic interpretation of the Bible based on the notion that the earthly and heavenly realms reflect each other in structure. There is no mention of ceremonial uncleanness, as in Orthodox canon law, no mention of an ontological lack that prohibits their celebrating Eucharist, as in much modern writing. There is certainly no hint of God relating himself to men and women in different ways, but precisely the opposite. The symbolism of ministry in the Didascalia involves a feminization of the Holy Spirit, which according to the last mentioned passage is precisely that part of the Godhead that mediates the effects of Eucharist, scripture and prayer. Therefore its function is closest to the priestly ministry as the mediation of Christ to people.

But the Didascalia is not consistent; there are currents running toward male superiority.

Those that please thee out of all the people thou shalt choose and appoint deacons: a man for the performance of the most things that are required, but a woman for the ministry of women. For there are houses whither thou canst not send a deacon to the women, on account of the heathen, but mayest send a deaconess. Also because in many other matters the office of a woman deacon is required. In the first place, when women go down into the water, those who go down into the water ought to be anointed by a deaconess with the oil of anointing; and where there is no woman at hand, and especially no deaconess, he who baptizes must of necessity anoint her who is being baptized. But where there is a woman, and especially a deaconess, it is not fitting that women should be seen by men: but with the imposition of hands do thou

anoint the head only. As of old the priests and kings were anointed in Israel, do thou in like manner, with the imposition of hands, anoint the head of those who receive baptism, whether of men or of women; and afterwards--whether thou thyself baptize or thou command the deacons or presbyters to baptize--let a woman deacon, as we have already said, anoint the women. But let a man pronounce over them the invocation of the divine Names in the water.

And when she who is being baptized has come up from the water, let the deaconess receive her, and teach and instruct her how the seal of baptism ought to be (kept) unbroken in purity and holiness. For this cause we say that the ministry of a woman deacon is especially needful and important. For our Lord and Savior also was ministered unto by women ministers, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the daughter of James and mother of Jose, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee; and other women besides. And thou also hast need of the ministry of a deaconess for many things; for a deaconess is required to go into the houses of the heathen where there are believing women, and to visit those who are sick, and to minister to them in that of which they have need, and to bathe those who have begun to recover from sickness.

Didascalia 16.3.12

This passage shows that the author of the Didascalia was not free from notions of male superiority. Men are to do most things except those that they cannot for the sake of modesty or the reputation of the church. This section is addressed to the bishops and puts both the deacon and the deaconess indirectly under his authority; they occupy the same position in the hierarchy. Even the language used, "γυνή δακονός," indicates that the women were seen as the counterparts of the male deacons. Notice that the women deacons teach other women. The author therefore considers women capable of dealing with the subject matter to be taught; the restrictions against women teaching men thus stem not from the idea that women is inherently incapable of teaching, but from the idea that it would be improper. The deaconess is a necessity because of social conventions and modesty. The question of whether there would be women deacons if these needs did not exist, does not, of course, arise. The real question is why the woman cannot perform that part of the baptism that consists in

the invocation of the Divine names. No reason for that is given and it contradicts present Roman and Anglican practice in which women have the capacity to validly baptize. If the reason the Didascalia denies priestly power to women is bound up with denying her the power to baptize, how shall we justify our selectivity in abandoning one part of the tradition and holding another, both from the same document?

In trying to draw some theological conclusions from the Didascalia, we must remember that it is not self-consciously a theological work, but a manual of church discipline. Its theological positions remain, for the most part, rudimentary. The tension between the woman's possession of the Spirit in the fullness of her constant participation in worship, and the subordinate place assigned her in the hierarchy and by social convention is not explored. So we have here a witness to the non-ordination of women, but again a witness whose reasons we would have difficulty accepting and whose own internal tension is part of the tradition.

Tertullian ca. 155-ca. 220

Tertullian represents the first stirring of Latin theological thinking in North Africa. He was a man of strong opinions strongly expressed, with a tendency towards extremism in both his theology and his rhetoric. He is also absolutely basic and formative for Latin theology, as the first important father to write in Latin whose writings have come down to us in an extensive way.

It would be easy to say that he is a misogynist and leave it at that. In his Catholic period he denied that women could perform any public

cultic activity whatsoever. But before we use Tertullian as a witness to a Christian tradition by which we are bound, we must ask the question: how did he conceive of woman, and what were his reasons for rejecting any kind of role for her as mediator of grace or teacher of the faithful? If we are bound by his prohibition, we are also bound by his reasons for that prohibition. These, too, form a part of Christian tradition. As I will show later, in Tertullian the question of selectivity in dealing with tradition is important. Many things that we do today he expressly forbade; thus we need some principle of discrimination if we follow him in some respects and deny his teaching in others.

The direct prohibition of woman taking any cultic role is found in De virginibus velandis, Chapter IX.

It is not permitted to a woman to speak in the church; but neither (is it permitted her) to teach, nor to baptize, nor to offer, nor to claim to herself a lot in any manly function, not to say (in any) sacerdotal office.¹⁷

The denial of office to woman is unequivocal. The context of the passage is a discussion of whether the word "woman" can be applied to virgins, or whether virgins form a category of their own. Tertullian is attempting to show that all the restrictions which apply to women in general also apply to virgins. The fact that they do not exercise the prerogatives of marriage does not mean they leave the class "woman." Again, Tertullian is not concerned here to state directly why women are excluded from the priesthood and teaching.

What is important is that the passage goes considerably farther than the Episcopal Church would now be willing to go. Since even Tertullian,

17. Tertullian, "The Writings of Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus," in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (eds.), Ante-Nicene Christian Library (Edinburgh: Clark, 1869), XVIII, 168. Except when otherwise noted, all future reference to the works of Tertullian will to to this set.

in other places, allows laymen the right to baptize, going so far as to state that in emergency situations it is a layman's duty to baptize, excluding women from this function at all times whatsoever seems to imply a radical distinction between men and women. Tertullian's justification for allowing laymen to baptize is that "what is equally received (baptism) can be equally given."¹⁸

The reason why the office is done regularly only by bishops and presbyters or deacons and not laymen is that:

Discipline and reverence incumbent on laymen--seeing that these powers belong (strictly) to their superiors--lest they assume to themselves the specific function of the bishop! Emulation of the episcopal office is the mother of schisms.

De Baptismo, Chapter 17, p. 251

Apparently, the restriction of baptism to church officers was to prevent schism resulting from a confusion of authority, and the authority to do baptism for the community was a part of the general authority of church officers. Women, who must learn modesty and reverence even for their lay husbands, are one notch farther down the authority-ladder even than laymen. This seems to be the reason Tertullian excludes women. The dignity of the office would be injured if they usurped its prerogatives. For example, again in De virginibus velandis he says concerning virgins, "More worthy distinction would have been conferred on her by according her some prerogative of manly office." (p. 169) Women were excused from office by Tertullian not only because of the Biblical evidence but also because they were really seen as inferior and therefore one step lower than men. They were unequal to the dignity and importance of church office. Since to give them manly office is a promotion, Tertullian seems

18. Ibid., p. 251.

to see women as in practice a degree beneath men in capacity and dignity. Unlike many modern thinkers on women's ordination, he does not allow women equality in all spheres except the liturgical priesthood. This must be kept in mind as we use Tertullian as a witness to Christian tradition.

In De baptismo Tertullian justifies his discrimination as obedience to I Corinthians 14:33b-36, but he also is strongly influenced by the fact that the heresy he fights originated with a woman, Quintilla. The impropriety of her teaching at all adds to his scorn of the heresy. He is especially at pains to refute the example his opposition apparently used: Theola baptizing in the Acts of Paul and Theola. He does this on two grounds: 1. The text is spurious and has nothing to do with the historical Paul. 2. Theola's action is inconsistent with Paul's stated¹⁹ teaching in Corinthians and Timothy. Two of the most prominent elements of the case the fathers make against the ordination of women are here: women tend to heresy, and Paul forbids them to teach.

Perhaps Tertullian's most famous misogynist passage is the introduction to De cultu feminarum:

If there existed upon earth a faith in proportion to the reward that faith will receive in heaven, no one of you, my beloved sisters, from the time when you came to know the living God and recognized your estate, that is, the condition of being a woman, would have desired too attractive a garb, much less anything that seemed too ostentatious. I think, rather, that you would have dressed in mourning garments and even neglected your exterior, acting that part of mourning and repentent Eve in order to expiate more fully by all sorts of penitential garb that which woman derives from Eve; the ignominy I mean, of original sin and the odium of being the cause of the fall of the human race. "In sorrow and anxiety you will bring forth, O woman, and you are subject to your husband and he is your master." Do you not believe that you are (each) an Eve?

19. Ibid., p. 251.

The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives on even in our times and so it is necessary that the guilt should live on, also. You are the one who opened the door to the Devil, you are the one who first plucked the fruit of the forbidden tree, who persuaded him whom the Devil was not strong enough to attack. All too easily you destroyed the image of God, man. Because of your desert, that is, death, even the Son of God had to die. And you still think of putting adornments over the skins of animals that cover you?²⁰

If, in the mind of Tertullian, woman is really all that, it is not surprising that he would not even consider the possibility of her becoming a priest. But today we can hardly accept that woman is all this: responsible for original sin, and the cause of the fall of the whole race, with the guilt of the original fall living on in each woman. It is a bit extreme. Tertullian also apparently believes that woman is inherently weaker than man in moral capacity and more open to temptation. She destroyed the image of God in man and on her account Jesus had to die.

There are three replies to this passage. First, it is based on a questionable interpretation of Genesis. In the texts dealing with the fall of man God punished both, and there is no indication that from God's point of view one was more responsible than the other. It is also unjust to assume that the guilt lives on in each woman to the present. In fact, this contradicts a very clear statement of Tertullian's in De baptismo, Chapter 18, that children are innocent. The inheritance of guilt must take place in a very odd way, passed from adult to adult.

Second, Tertullian is trying to promote a sober, almost ascetical style of clothing and living for Christian women. His rhetoric is directed toward convincing his readers of the importance of this for them; he is not abstractly considering the nature of woman. Third, he is not fully

20. Ibid., p. 304.

consistent in his various discussions of the fall. For instance, in An Exhortation to Chastity, he spends a whole chapter talking about the fall and the origin of sin and expressly calls Adam, "that originator of our race and our sin."²¹ We need to be careful that we do not demand a greater consistency from Tertullian than we would from another person; he can and does change his mind and his argument, depending on his objective. We involve ourselves in moral equivocation if we claim his support in a matter on which his witness is fundamentally ambiguous.

In De virginibus velandis Tertullian reveals an approach to women that may have influenced his exclusion of them from priesthood. In Chapter 7 he discusses the danger of the unveiled woman who tempts angels to fall from their usual places. In other words, she disturbs the established orders of creation. Here and in many other places we see this fear of the power of women to arouse men as a reason for their exclusion from public activity. The frequency with which he refers to this power means it is probably of some importance to him.

In De cultu feminarum he addresses women on this very question.

But why are we a (source of) danger to our neighbor? Why do we impart concupiscence into our neighbor? which concupiscence, if God, in "amplifying the law," do not dissociate in (the way of) penalty from the actual commission of fornication, I know not whether He allows impunity to him who has been the cause of perdition to some other. For that other, as soon as he has felt concupiscence after your beauty, and has mentally already committed (the deed) which his concupiscence pointed to, perishes; and you have been made the sword which destroys him; so that, albeit you be free from the actual crime, you are not free from the odium (attaching to it) . . .

For albeit comeliness is not to be censured, as being a bodily happiness, as being an additional outlay of the divine plastic art, as being a kind of goodly garment of the soul; yet it is to be feared, just on account of the injuriousness and violence of suitors: which (injuriousness and violence) even the father of

21. Ibid., p. 3.

the faith, Abraham, greatly feared in regard of his own wife's grace; and Issac, by falsely representing Rebecca as his sister, purchased safety by insult!²²

Tertullian's sense of the common responsibility of the members of the church for each other is the motive for his denial of a visible place to woman. It is true that Tertullian has a double standard: he spends more time on the danger of beautiful women to men than on that of handsome men to women, but the point is clear--women priests would be a fantastic danger to the salvation of every man in the congregation. But we cannot escape the question of the responsible use of our sexuality. The temptation and danger are reciprocal for men and women, and the double standard Tertullian proposes can no longer be applied with even a shadow of justice.

Through all this we must remember that Tertullian is a literalist in scriptural interpretation, and also a perfectionist; given a choice of two interpretations he will always take the more demanding one. There is not a hint of a sense of historic conditionedness of events and customs in his writings. The Bible is the Bible, and it is authoritative and that is that.²³ Since Tertullian bases much of his thinking about women on Biblical material, this must be remembered in any attempt to use him today. Are arguments and traditions based on a form of exegesis we can no longer accept still part of authoritative tradition for us?

To summarize Tertullian's position:

Women are forbidden all office in the church that involves them in leadership or in public visibility. They may not baptize. They must

22. Ibid., XI, 317-318.

23. George Tavard, Women in Christian Tradition (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1973), p. 58.

expiate their guilt for the first sin of Eve, and consequently for the death of Christ. Women are a cut below men in dignity and authority and their capacity to express them; therefore, they are hardly full members of the church in the same fashion as men and cannot, consequently, hold any sacerdotal office. This hardly represents a tradition common to the whole church, where women can baptize, at least in emergency situations; where women are full members of the church, at least in theory; and their membership is a product of the one priesthood bestowed by one baptism and sealed by one sort of constant witness to one Lord and revelation for all. A man who denies this is a dangerous witness in our world of hatred springing from disunity of sex, race and nation.

Yet even Tertullian can surprise us. This misogynist writes in

Ad uxorum:

How beautiful, then, the marriage of two Christians, two who are one in hope, one in desire, one in the way of life they follow, one in the religion they practice. They are as brother and sister, both servants of the same Master. Nothing divides them, either in flesh or in spirit. They are, in very truth, two in one flesh; and where there is but one flesh there is also but one spirit. They pray together, they worship together, they fast together; instructing one another, encouraging one another, strengthening one another. Side by side they visit God's church and partake of God's banquet; side by side they face difficulties and persecution, share their consolations. They have no secrets from one another; they never shun each other's company; they never bring sorrow to each other's hearts. Unembarrassed they visit the sick and assist the needy. They give alms without anxiety; they attend the Sacrifice without hindrance; . . . Hearing and seeing this, Christ rejoices. To such as these He gives his peace. Where there are two together, there also he is present; and where He is, there evil is not.²⁴

Note that in this passage collectiveness and mutuality are stressed, not rank. The idea that the two together exclude evil is especially

24. Tertullian, "Ad uxorum," in Ancient Christian Writers (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1956), XIII, 35-36.

remarkable in the light of Tertullian's other assertions that evil comes through women. Apparently this exclusion of evil comes through mutual support in worship and good works. The implication is that the evil effect of sexuality is overcome as men and women support each other in living the Christian life. I submit that, with one modification--that we see the evil potential of sexuality overcome rather than its necessarily evil effect--that this ideal is worthy of our own effort. What would we think if this were the only passage of Tertullian's to survive? It stands a monument to the complexity of human character and a condemnation of the over-hasty generalizations of historians anxious for a simple truth.

Origen ca. 185-253

Origen was the first great Christian systematic theologian. Later eastern thought is largely determined by whether one is for or against Origen and what parts of his vast system one accepts or rejects. His position in Christian theological tradition is absolutely pivotal. He greatly developed the allegorical form of exegesis, did a huge amount of text-critical work, and systematized Biblical interpretation in the Alexandrine school.

I see two basic thrusts in his thought about women. One, sexual existence does not belong to the first creation before the rational souls turn away from God and fall into the material world. Souls in the first creation have angelic bodies which are without sex. Any mention of sexuality in reference to heaven or God Origen always allegorizes to mean the

perfect man, Jesus, joined to the perfect woman, the church. Note that as in Clement there is some distaste for all sexuality whatsoever.

Origen's writings are full of allegorizations of masculine and feminine images from the Bible. It would be easy to make the mistake of using his allegorical exegesis to construct theories concerning his thought about women, though with care, a valid construction might be possible. But he himself gives us a warning. In his Commenary on the Song of Songs he says

And, just as in this place you will not think that Wisdom is a woman because she appears under a feminine name, so also you must not understand the left and right hands of the Word of God in a corporeal sense, simply because He is called the Bridegroom, which is an epithet of male significance. Nor must you take the Bride's embraces in that way, simply because the word 'bride' is of feminine gender.

Rather, although the 'Word' of God is of the masculine gender in Greek, and neuter with ourselves, yet all these matters with which this passage deals must be thought of in a manner that transcends masculine and neuter and feminine, and everything whatever to which these words refer. And this applies not only to the "word" of God, but also to His Church and to the perfect soul, who likewise is here called 'the bride'. For thus says the Apostle: "For in Christ there is neither male nor female, but we are all one in Him."

The Divine Scripture expresses these things after the manner of human speech, for the sake of those who cannot understand them unless they are thus couched in terms to which they are accustomed. The words in which we hear them, therefore, will be well known and familiar; but our perception of them, if we give them the perception they deserve, will be of things divine and incorporeal.²⁶

This passage is important as it confirms the fact that when Origen is thinking self-consciously about what his imagery means he does not impute any masculine or feminine significance to the heavenly world. Since he was one of the originators of the image of the church as the bride of

25. Tavard, p. 67.

26. Origen, Commentary on the Song of Songs (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1957), Book III, pp. 200-201.

Christ, it is important that he self-consciously rejected at the very beginning any earthly or sexual significance in his language. Those who point to the necessary maintenance of these images must grapple with the fact that the very person who first developed them warned us against getting caught up in the masculine and feminine aspects of the image. Those who argue for a strictly masculine priesthood on the grounds that only such a priesthood is capable of reflecting the truth of these images must face the fact that their appeal to tradition is false at its source. Origen apparently does not want us to concentrate on or maintain the masculinity and femininity of the images of the church and Christ in their relations to each other. Origen is very stern about this; even thinking about bride and bridegroom in neuter terms is rejected along with the masculine and feminine.

On the other hand, Origen can produce some amazingly subordinat-
 ionist ideas. "God does not stoop to look on what is corporeal and
 27
 feminine." And also, "It is not proper to a woman to speak at the
 Assembly, however admirable or holy what she says may be, merely because
 28
 it comes from feminine lips."

What are we to make of this? First, note the connection between corporeality and femininity in the first quotation. I suspect that the inferior quality of women referred to comes from the supposition that they have fallen farther from the good of the original creation than man. Thus, if Origen believed that to be placed in a woman's body signified a greater degree of turning away from God, then these sentences become

28. Henri Crouzel, Virginité et mariage selon Origène (Paris-Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1962), p. 137. He is quoting Origen's Selecta in Exodus 25:17.

28. Ibid., p. 142, n.1. Patrologia Graecae, XII, c. 296-297.

understandable.

The Divine Scriptures do not mean to separate men and women by their sex. Before God there is no distinction of sex; one is called male or female according to the quality of one's soul.²⁹

For Origen, the creation of the material universe itself was a result of the fall, and the more one became enmeshed in it the more serious his fall had been.

But then being a woman would be punishment for a fault, not a fault in itself. This whole idea led to a symbolic use of the word 'woman' to refer to the inferior part of the soul.³⁰ This may also have something to do with the Neo-Platonic speculation which identifies the masculine with nous and the feminine with psyche. Some one needs to work out the exact form of all this: I am really just speculating. But in the light of Origen's specific disclaimer of meaning masculine/feminine in his use of allegorical imagery for God and the church, we need to be careful how much of this element in his imagery we appeal to as we determine what the church's policy toward real people should be.

On women priests Origen furnishes some direct opinions.

Everyone speaks or would be able to speak, if he receives a revelation, except women who should remain silent in the church, the Apostle says. This is a prescription which is not obeyed by the followers of women, those who allow themselves to be instructed by Priscilla and Maximilla . . . Let us respond to those objections which carry conviction. "Philip the Evangelist," they say, "has four daughters and they prophesied." We are going to resolve the objection . . . the daughters of Philip prophesied,

29. Crouzel, p. 138; Tavad, p. 60, quoting Origen's Homilies in Joshua, IX, 9.

30. See Origen, Commentary on the Song of Songs, p. 130, n.1.

Haye van der Meer, Women Priests in the Catholic Church? A Theological-Historical Investigation (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1973), p. 62, 64. As van der Meer points out, this thinking is especially strong in Philo.

but in no case did they speak in the church; we see nothing approaching it in the Acts of the Apostles . . . A woman can have license to be a prophetess, but that can not give her permission to speak in the church. When the prophetess Miriam spoke (Ex. 15:20) she was at the head of a certain number of women.³¹

This passage is anti-Montanist polemic and aims at discrediting the Montanist movement by charging them with misunderstanding the story of Philip's daughters, one of their favorite proof-texts. It may also be an attempt on Origen's part to deal with the contradiction between I Corinthians 11:2-16 and I Corinthians 14:33b-36. Paul seems to give women the right to prophesy in the former and then withdrew it in the latter. Again, we see the polemic against heresy and the pauline injunctions against women speaking in church as the combination used to deny cultic functions to women.

Another similar passage is:

The widows have ecclesiastical honor for they wash the feet of the saints through the word of Spiritual teaching--not, however, the feet of holy men, but of holy women. For it is not permitted that women teach or rule over men. He desires that the women teach good by training young women, but not young men, to purity; for it is improper that a woman be the teacher of a man.³²

Notice the allegorical nature of this passage: washing the feet of the saints is an image for teaching. Widows are allowed to teach women, but not men, because it is "improper" for a woman to teach a man. This impropriety seems to have vanished in seminaries where women now teach and in pulpits where women deacons now preach. In the ancient world, the notion of teaching was associated with that of ruling; this

31. P. Labriolle, The Sources for the History of Montanism, Texts in Greek, Latin and Syriac (Fribourg-Paris: O'Geschwend, 1913), pp. 55-56.

32. Origen, "Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans," in Patrologia Graecae, PG, XIII, c. 242; cf. PG, XIV, c. 772.

helps to explain why, in that time, women could not teach--they could not rule.

In the light of all this, and given Origen's basically emanational thinking, it is natural for him to deny mediating power or any sort of authority to women. One who is farther away from the source cannot mediate to one nearer to it. Women cannot mediate graces to or educate men because they are farther from the Truth. The distinctions of sex then result from the quality of soul and the type of education necessary to recover the primeval vision of God. The restrictions on woman's dress and movements are the recognition of her different needs if she is to attain the same salvation as man. But notice that woman qua woman is inferior in the earthly order, whatever the soul's status elsewhere.

If my guess about Origen is correct, we have here a thorough-going subordinationism coupled with a denial of ultimate distinctions. Women cannot be ordained because in the earthly order they are incapable of filling a priest's mediational and judicial role. Not many of today's opponents of the ordination of women want to assert that woman is inferior, yet for Origen her inferiority cuts across all of life and is not confined to church affairs. If we decide to follow Origen's tradition we again get more than we bargained for, for men could only teach men and women teach women. The whole Neo-Platonic context of this thought is gone from today's world, and we would take the results of his symbol structure, the inferiority of women, without the justification by the structure itself, the hierarchical nature of reality resulting from the original fall of the souls.

Epiphanius of Salamis 315-403

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, was not noted as a theologian, but as an ascetic and an opponent of heresy, as he understood it. His numerous works are historically important as records of his time, but must be used cautiously when one tries to construct from them the true views of his opponents. He was also the ecclesiastical busy-body of the fourth century. His extreme anti-Origenism led him into conflict with John, Bishop of Jerusalem and later allowed Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria, to dupe him in the affair of the deposition of Chrysostom. His witness is valuable, but must be used with extreme caution.

He is also the most vocal of all the fathers who specifically deny priesthood to women. The center of his opposition is in Adversus haereses (Panarion) LXXIX.4 where he discusses the Collyridians and other heretics who show Mary divine honors. In violent and bitter language he accuses women of being the means by which these abuses are maintained, " . . . for the female sex is easily seduced, weak, and without much understanding. The devil seems to vomit out this disorder through women."³⁴

Epiphanius then gives long lists of priests from both the New and Old Testaments to prove that women have never held priestly office. Even Eve, who presumed to eat the forbidden fruit, was not forward enough to presume to claim the priesthood. The argument finishes with

33. So far as I know, this has not yet been translated into English except in fits and snatches. See Patrologia Graecae XLII, c. 740 ff.

34. Meer, p. 48.

the syllogistic statement: If Jesus had wanted women to be priests then he would have made Mary one, if he had wanted women to baptize he would have been baptized by Mary rather than John the baptist. Therefore Jesus did not want women to be priests and we, consequently, may not have them.

Epiphanius then moves from arguments concerning what is prohibited to women to what is allowed to them. There are two legitimate positions for them, deaconess and prophetess. Both of these are useful only in very limited situations. The reason for deaconesses is that decency be preserved in the baptism of women; even then the purpose is not to spare the feelings of the woman but to preserve the purity of the male clergy.

This section of Adversus haereses forms the longest continuous patristic discourse on the priesthood and position of women that has come to my attention. Some very peculiar assumptions inform the argument. One is that there is a distinct difference in the possible modes of relation between man and God and woman and God. In his analysis of the creation stories Epiphanius claims that the Devil was originally unable to tempt Adam effectively because Adam gained his strength directly from knowledge of God. But when he turned to the woman he was able to tempt her to the fall because women are the ignorance of humanity.

I suspect that this is an offshoot from speculation about males being made in the divine image and females not. At any rate, he assumes

35. I think it worth noting that Epiphanius was a monk and famous for his asceticism. Even if one cannot question his knowledge of women of his own time, which one can, one may certainly see that times have changed. His whole attitude toward women is sour; see Patrologia Graecae, LXI, c. 880-881, 948-949, 643.

36. Patrologia Graecae, XLI, c. 643.

that the original male's bond with God was closer than the original female's, his relation was direct and enabled him to receive a sufficiency of strength to meet the temptation, hers was indirect and her knowledge of the divine more precarious. If one assumes the truth of this scheme of things the reasons for denying priesthood to women are obvious. Men would be better mediators of grace because the very nature of their being makes them more transparent to the divine. They are capable of direct knowledge of that which they represent. Woman, who is not a being transparent to God but more a part of the world, is not capable of this direct knowledge and therefore cannot serve as a means of transferring it to others.

A lack of power to mediate does not, however, affect woman's capacity for holy behavior. One can respond in obedience without being able to transmit the command to be obedient. That seems to be the rational outgrowth of Epiphanius' position although he did not carry it out as I have.

One needs to be on guard, especially in Epiphanius, but in patristic literature generally, lest he become caught in the lack of clear distinction between woman as a symbolic figure and woman as a human individual. Women to Epiphanius symbolize ignorance, but before we use this as a basis for action today, we must assume that all individual women partake of the nature of the symbol. I wonder if the use of woman in patristic writing to symbolize ignorance or inferiority has led to restrictions on women as human beings because the content of the symbol was assumed to apply to the person. If womanhood symbolizes ignorance it is too easy to turn the situation around and say that women are ignorant. The relation between the symbolic and impersonal use of feminine imagery

and the actual responses of the fathers to living women needs much more study. The cordiality between Chrysostom and Olympia, Melania and Jerome ought to make one suspicious that word and deed do not always mesh in the world of the early church.

Epiphanius is about as close as the fathers get to a theological discussion of the question of women's ordination. Even today we hear Epiphanius' major argument, that if Jesus had wanted something X to happen ever he would have performed X during his earthly life, or at least left us an indisputable pointer to it. If anyone were to take this seriously he would have to abandon much, from the doctrine of the trinity to the use of pews in church (the latter, at least, not a bad idea). More specifically, this way of thinking requires that Christianity abandon any sense of historical development, and that we assume not only that Christ has a dimension of himself that is beyond time, but that the Christ who was incarnated as a human being be beyond time in the expression of his humanity. That seems to violate the statement that Christ really became human and subject to the limitations of a human person. To form the Church around the rigid imitation of such a Christ denies the presence and power of the Holy Spirit as a guide in the present church. Such arguments as those of Epiphanius are particularly unacceptable after the discovery that the historical Jesus is a rather more remote figure than the nineteenth or even earlier centuries had imagined. To say, after Schweitzer, that the church can do only what we know Jesus of Nazareth did means that the church can do precious little.

But Epiphanius' real concern in the passage against the Collyridians was to determine the proper position of Mary in the Christian faith. She is not to be offered divine honor. Apparently the honor given to

women among the Collyridians was due to their near divinization of Mary, and Epiphanius' attack on their women priests was really an attack on the exaggeration of the Mary cult.

Here again the question of women priests has come up in connection with the suppression of heresy. It never occurred to Epiphanius to discuss the issue outside of that context. We, however, are discussing the issue outside that context, asking the question whether women priests are possible apart from any heretical elements. In a very important way Epiphanius' writing against the Collyridians, Tertullian's writing against those who denied baptism (or his writings for the Montanists), Clement's and Origen's writings against various groups of gnostics were all asking a different sort of question than the one we are asking. They attack women priests because they see such growing out of a heresy; we ask whether women priests are possible as an outgrowth of orthodoxy. They do not seek to answer our question, and so their witness loses much of its force because they simply do not deal with whether women could be priests in radically different times and places from their own.

John Chrysostom 344-407

Chrysostom represents the moderate Antiochene school of exegesis; although he did not reject allegory outright, he did use considerable 'realistic' interpretation of Scripture. His expository homilies on the New Testament and his letters give us an unrivaled picture of church life at the turn of the fourth century. His importance for us lies in the ambiguity regarding women in his life and work--an almost perfect example of the tensions that criss-cross patristic thought.

He is among those fathers who specifically deny the possibility of a woman being a priest. The following passage is typical of his prohibitions.

Yet he [Jesus] might have said to him [Peter], "If thou lovest me practice fasting, sleeping on the ground and prolonged vigils, defend the wronged, be as father to orphans and supply the place of a husband to their mother." But as a matter of fact, setting aside all these things, what does He say? "Tend my sheep." For those things I have already mentioned might easily be performed by many even of those who are under authority, women as well as men; but when it is required to preside over the church, and to be entrusted with the care of so many souls, the whole female sex must retire before the magnitude of the task, and the majority of men also; and we must bring forward those who to a large extent surpass all others, and soar as much above them in excellence of spirit as Saul overtopped the whole Hebrew nation in bodily stature; or rather far more.³⁷

Two things jump out from this passage; the first is that the ability to be a priest is connected with the difference between being under authority and exercising it. The second is that the priesthood is the greatest service and requires those of the greatest spiritual ability.

The passage goes on to say:

. . . let the distinction between the pastor and his charge be as great as that between the rational man and the irrational creature, not to say even greater inasmuch as the risk is concerned with things of far greater importance . . . but he who has human beings entrusted to him, the rational flock of Christ, incurs a penalty in the first place for the loss of the sheep, which goes beyond material things and touches on a far greater and more difficult conflict.

Chrysostom then goes on to describe the unruliness of the Christian, spiritual wickedness in high places and the superhuman requirements placed on priests in their attempts to deal with these things.

So the greatest service to God is also the most dangerous and difficult. The whole of Chrysostom's On the Priesthood emphasizes the

37. John Chrysostom, "On the Priesthood," in P. Schaff (ed.), A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), IX, 2.2.

superlative accomplishments required of one who would fulfill the priestly office; in fact, it is his apologia for having tried to avoid ordination. The implication is that the priesthood is confined to men because only they are capable of shouldering such a great burden, especially in the area we today would call the cure of souls. It is the ability to exercise authority and rule, which men possess and women do not, that is the prime requirement for the priesthood. Furthermore, notice especially in the second quotation that the cleric is somehow more holy than the lay person.

What sorts of assumptions inform Chrysostom's placing of women on a lower social level and perhaps on a lower level of creation?

And what may be the cause of his setting them under so great subjection? Because the woman is in some sort a weaker being and easily carried away and light minded. Here you see why he set over them their husbands as teachers, for the benefit of both, for so he both rendered women orderly and the husbands he made anxious as having to deliver to their wives exactly what they heard.³⁸

Another example of this:

If it be asked, what has this to do with women of the present day? It shows that the male sex enjoyed the higher honor. Man was first formed; and elsewhere he shows their superiority. "Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." Why then does he say this, He wishes the man to have the preeminence in every way.³⁹

Given the requirements for the priesthood mentioned in the first quoted passage, these passages explain why Chrysostom denied priesthood to women. There is an inherent weakness of mind and a predestined lack of honor built into the very creation of woman; these make women unequal to the great responsibility of the priesthood. As "easily carried away

38. Ibid., XII, 222.

39. Ibid., XIII, 435.

and light minded" Chrysostom apparently thinks their special problem is lack of constancy in purpose. This is confirmed when "orderliness" is listed as one of the goods gained when husbands rule their wives. Apparently, without masculine direction, women would become disorderly and wayward. A lack of strength of purpose would certainly exclude one from priesthood which for Chrysostom required a constant watchfulness over the flock and great consistency in judgment of parishoners and in the denunciation of sin.

In the same homily Chrysostom states an extended justification of the prohibition on women speaking given in I Corinthians 14:40. "Let everything be done decently and in good order." He understands the 'good order' to refer to the prohibition of women speaking in church and further to the general superiority of men over women. The key idea is that of preserving proper rank. This points directly to the fact that for Chrysostom there is a double hierarchy, that of men over women on one⁴⁰ hand, and of priest over people on the other hand.

Interestingly, this double hierarchy becomes mixed up when an unbelieving husband is taught by his Christian wife. Chrysostom is care-⁴¹ful to justify this. Apparently, there is no ontological objection to woman teaching; she may do so when she has the greater knowledge of the truth.

The superiority of the priest over the people is illustrated by another passage from On the Priesthood:

40. Donald F. Winslow, "Priesthood and Sexuality in the Post-Nicene Fathers," (paper presented to the conference of Anglican Theologians, Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, Ill., April 2-5, 1975), p. 5.

41. Chrysostom, XI, 554; and XII, 107.

For if any one will consider how great a thing it is for one, being a man, and compassed with flesh and blood, to be enabled to draw nigh to that blessed and pure nature, he will then clearly see what great honor the grace of the Spirit has vouchsafed to priests; since by their agency these rites are celebrated, and others no wise inferior to these both in respect of our dignity and our salvation. For they who inhabit the earth and make their abode there are entrusted with the administration of things which are in Heaven, and have received an authority which God has not given to angels or archangels. For it has been said of them, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven." They who rule on earth have indeed authority to bind, but only the body: whereas this binding lays hold of the soul and penetrates the heavens; and what priests do here below God ratifies above, and the master confirms the sentence of his servants. For indeed, what is it but all manner of heavenly authority which He has given them when He says, "Whose sins ye remit they are remitted, and whose sins ye retain, they are retained?"⁴²

I give this rather long quote to show that Chrysostom's idea is that the priest is definitely superior in authority to other men. He has the power of heaven at his disposal and therefore an authority greater than worldly kings and the angels of heaven. This is a favorite theme with Chrysostom and an important element in his thinking. The power of the priesthood seems to flow outward to all who associate with it. If the daughter of a priest committed a crime, she was punished more severely than others because of her proximity to the holy office.⁴³

To understand Chrysostom's views on women and priesthood we must place them in the context of this double hierarchy. It is ridiculous, given this framework, to have the inferior woman usurp the place which requires the exercise of such power and carries such requirements of constancy and responsibility. Chrysostom is even capable of using his congregation's acceptance of this man-woman hierarchy in preaching. In his

42. Chrysostom, IX, 47.

43. Ibid., p. 80.

Homily No. 3 on Ephesians he shames the men in his congregation by pointing to the greater deeds of women who are yet inherently weaker and inferior to men. It is incongruous that women surpass men in spiritual exercise, but that is precisely what is happening and the men ought to be ashamed.⁴⁴

It might even be that Chrysostom would see the exclusion of women from priesthood as merciful because it saves them from suffering the consequences of the weakness of their nature.

It is better for you to be under him and to have him as your Lord, than that living freely and on your own, you fall into the pit.⁴⁵

He appeals to reason in explaining the subjection of women.

For with us indeed the woman is reasonably subjected to the man; since equality of honor causeth contention. And not for this cause only, but by reason also of the deceit which happened in the beginning. Wherefore you see, she was not subjected as soon as she was made; nor, when He brought her to the man, did either she hear any such thing from God, nor did the man say any such word to her; he said indeed, that she was 'bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh' but of rule or subjection he nowhere made mention unto her. But when she made an ill use of her privilege and she who had been made a helper was found to be an ensnarer and ruined all, then she is justly told for the future, 'thy turning shall be to thy husband.'⁴⁶

The Bible passage mentioned in the last sentence is Genesis 3:16 where God announces the punishments for the disobedience of eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge. Chrysostom uses the same basic pattern of interpretation as Margaret Thrall did in her pioneering work on women in Anglican orders. Chrysostom sees the subjection of women as a punishment or a result of the fall and not as the natural condition God desired

44. Chrysostom, XIII, 114-116.

45. Chrysostom, IX, 145.

46. Chrysostom, XII, 150.

for her.

One also wonders how Chrysostom can justify equality of honor and therefore contention between man and man and not between man and woman. One also wonders whether the ill use to which the man put his own freedom ought not to be remembered if we still intend to use the stories of the fall or the Christian traditions which spring from those stories in justifying our own action.

But this passage is found in the context of trying to discover what is meant by saying that God is the head of Christ and man is the head of woman. Chrysostom struggles to preserve the "reasonable subjection" of the woman while at the same time he seeks to say that her obedience is to be free obedience and honorable and not such as a slave would give. He tries to distinguish between the subjugation of the woman to the man and that of Christ to God. At the same time he says:

For if Paul had meant to speak of rule and subjection, as thou sayest, he would not have brought forward the instance of a wife, but rather of a slave and a master. For what if the wife be under subjection to us? It is as a wife, as free, as equal in honor.⁴⁷

What precisely this means is not clear to me, but at least it shows Chrysostom struggling to determine woman's place and not just blindly and with easy conscience accepting a subordinate place for her in all ways.⁴⁸ We can easily see here the tension between the equality of men and women--an idea Chrysostom does hit occasionally--and the subordinate position of women which he assumes is the nature of things.

The struggle may be summarized:

47. Chrysostom, XII, 180.

48. Ibid., p. 153. The struggle is repeated in regard to I Corinthians 11:11.

1. In the original intention of God man and woman are equal.
2. Male dominance results from the fall.
3. The dominance is preserved but transformed in the church.

Women are subject to men, but their subjection is to be a freely-offered acknowledgement of the real situation.

There is one other reason why Chrysostom denied priesthood to women. The treatise On the Priesthood was written by him as an apologia for his attempt to avoid priestly office, on the grounds that the responsibility was too great for his ability. He makes a common fourth-century assumption, based on this idea, that those who desire priestly office are, by that very fact, unworthy of it. Women are therefore caught--they are not priests now, and any attempt on their part to become priests is an expression of that very arrogance that renders one unfit for the office. ⁴⁹

But as in so many other church fathers, there is a complexity in Chrysostom that we need to see. His eulogies on women are at least equal to those written on men. I notice, however, that praise is bestowed mainly on individuals who raise themselves above that which could be expected from woman as a class, while blame rests on the class of women as such. There seems to be tension between the sensitivity to individuals, as in the case of his wonderful letters to the deaconess Olympia, and the condemnation of the nature of woman, his ideas about the class itself. Women are always most praised when they are farthest from the expression of feminine sexuality. ⁵⁰ I suppose, and this is mere speculation, that the notion of deification of persons means that one, as he or she

49. Chrysostom, IX, 50-51.

50. Ibid., p. 303.

approaches that God who is without body, parts, or passions, requires a sloughing off of sexuality. In the ancient world woman's sexual nature was more closely identified with their entire lives, while for the male priest it was only one element among others. To escape this world he had to transcend not a masculinity that was co-extensive with his being, but his human nature as such, in which his sexuality was only one element.

So how does Chrysostom fit into tradition? He represents a line of thought that claims more than mere difference is involved in the masculine-feminine distinctions. For him, the male possesses a definite superiority that the female lacks in that he has the capacity to rule, to speak publicly, to keep his attention on one thing. Chrysostom will have no part of any separate-but-equal idea. To claim Chrysostom as a precedent requires that one state one's position on his basic assumption that the male is generally superior and the female generally inferior. It is hardly honest to accept him as a witness to the Christian tradition that women cannot be priests and then allow women a freedom in all other areas that would have horrified him. Most moderns who argue against the ordination of women are chary of expressing that sort of across-the-board inferiority; they try to establish some kind of separate-but-equal position. Chrysostom was made of sterner stuff, but his value as a witness to Christian tradition declines as one accepts the consequences of his position in the small area of priesthood and rejects them in the larger one of the world. Again, the arbitrary way we have formed our tradition to support our prejudices is cast before us, and the demand for scholarly honesty requires us to reject Chrysostom as a relevant witness to the non-ordination of women.

Chrysostom and Olympia

Most patristic research has focused either on the Fathers' biblical commentaries or on their doctrinal and ascetical works. There has been relatively little exploration of the actual concrete relations between men and women who were living in the patristic world. To study this would give a context for understanding the statements about women made in the doctrinal works, commentaries, and ascetical treatises. Such a study would be in the realm of social history and not doctrinal history. Without such study we neither know how much the patristic strictures against women were carried out in practice nor even what they really mean.

This section is a sketch for such a study. I choose the relationship between Chrysostom and Olympia because of the amount of material available to draw from, its accessibility to me, and because Olympia's discharging of her office represents women's power in the ancient church. I also wish to establish beyond doubt that the patristic position on the nature of women is full of tension, that their witness is not unanimous, and that only by arbitrarily limiting the evidence we consider can we assert a consistent case against the ordination of women.

In Chrysostom we see his actual experience with women putting a strain on the images of women he inherited from his culture. History allows us a glimpse of his private feelings that is a rare thing in antiquity. We know something about the actual relations between Jerome and Melania, between Augustine and Monica, and we know something about the importance of women in the lives of the Cappadocian fathers. But nowhere

else to my knowledge does the relation between a man and a woman in the church come into such high relief as in the seventeen letters of Chrysostom to the deaconess Olympia. These letters are urbane, humorous, caring and full of an attractive trust between Chrysostom the man and
 51
 Olympia the woman.

When John arrived in Constantinople, Olympia was already well established as the head of the deaconesses of Constantinople and, according to Palladius, a major advisor of Chrysostom's predecessor, Nectarius. "I know that the blessed Nectarius made great use of her and that he
 52
 followed her counsel in the affairs of the church." Immediately we see here an expansion of the deaconess' traditional functions. Giving ecclesiastical advice to archbishops had never been something women were supposed to do. This statement by Palladius also conflicts with numerous comments by Chrysostom himself that women should not intrude themselves

51. Sources for the biography of Olympia are:

Palladius, Lausiac History, 56:2 and 61.

Palladius, Dialogues on the Life of John Chrysostom, 10, 16, 17.

Sozomen, Historia ecclesiastica, 8, 9, 24.

Gregory Nazianzus, Carmen, in Patrologia Graecae, XXXVII, c. 1542-1550.

"Vita S. Olympiadia Deacon," Analecta Bollandia, XV (1896), 409-423; also in Revue de l'Orient chrétien, II (1906), 225-250.

"Narratio Sergiae de Translatione S. Olympias," Analecta Bollandia, XVI (1897), 44-45; also in Revue de l'Orient chrétien, CXXVI (1907), 258-268.

Lettres à Olympia (Sources chrétiennes No. 13) (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1947).

The Palladius material is the best; not only is it fuller, but he was a contemporary and eye witness of many of the events he records. Since he was a partisan of Chrysostom he needs to be used cautiously, especially as he had his own reasons to be unfriendly to Theophilus. But careful study seems to vindicate most of his statements; he is more trustworthy than many historians of the ancient world. The best sources not necessarily for facts, but for opinions and feelings, are the letters in Sources chrétienne.

52. Palladius, Dialogos 17; Source chrétiennes, XIII, 15; Patrologia Graecae, XLVII, c. 61.

into ecclesiastical authority.

There is little doubt but that Palladius' statement is correct. It receives confirmation from two sources. In his own Lausiaca History he speaks of Olympia and adds to the classical functions of the deaconess those of "talking to the priests and receiving bishops with honor."⁵⁴ Hints of this increased status also occur in Chrysostom's own letters to Olympia from his exile at Cucusus. He gives her instructions to prevent the ordination of a new bishop to the Goths because the man would be picked by his enemies who care nothing for the health of the church. He also instructs her to attempt to detach Maruthus, bishop of Martyropolis in Persia, from the party of his enemies. Failing that, she is at least⁵⁵ to send him back to Persia, where he belongs anyway. Chrysostom was apparently using Olympia as his agent in Constantinople during his exile. Such commissions indicate that Chrysostom's trust in the political abilities of Olympia was out of all proportion to the usual patristic assumptions about the ability of women to exercise political or any other form of public authority.

In the same letter John instructs Olympia to make no attempt to have him moved from Cucusus. He thought her capable, then, of taking the initiative and devising independent policy.

So the picture begins to emerge of a strong-willed and capable woman, one whom her contemporaries believed could exercise power. She was the trusted advisor of two archbishops, Nectarius and Chrysostom.

53. Chrysostom, IX, 49.

54. Palladius, Lausiaca History, LVI, 15.

55. Chrysostom, Lettres à Olympias, p. 151.

She was responsible for "greeting" bishops, that is, providing housing and food for any bishop who happened to be visiting Constantinople on business. This was a most sensitive position. Finally, she became the political agent of Chrysostom in the capital. There is no hint that anyone saw anything scandalous in her authority; it was remarkable but not impossible. Here the practice of Chrysostom and his statements in literary texts conflict. As I have shown, Chrysostom's main reason for keeping women out of the priesthood was their supposed inability to exercise power and take responsibility. The power allowed to Olympia points to a tension between Chrysostom's theory and his practice.

Of course, Olympia had an unusual background. Her grandfather, Ablavius, had been Praetorian Prefect under Constantine the Great, and one of her aunts had married the King of Armenia. She was orphaned early and raised by Theodosia, a sister of Amphilochus, the bishop of Iconium, a partisan of Basil the Great. Theodosia was the leader of a group of well-educated women who studied theology and the scriptures. Here Olympia entered the theological world of the Cappadocian Fathers. Gregory Nazianzen visited the house frequently enough to become acquainted with her and wrote a special work, Carmen, for her wedding with Nebridius. In this work he calls Olympia an example to all in word and deed. That means, she discussed theology and scripture. John's letters to her assume considerable knowledge of the New Testament, evident especially in those sections where some point of spiritual counsel turns on
56
the understanding of a New Testament episode.

56. Sources chrétienne, p. 9. Malingry does a good job of bringing together the evidence about the events of Olympia's life and most of the preceding material comes from there.

She was married at 19 to Nebridius, the city prefect of Constantinople. He died shortly thereafter, and Olympia decided to remain a widow. She was ordained to that office at 25 by Nectarius and placed in charge of the 250 women living next to the bishop's church in Constantinople and dedicated to its service. This consecration at so young an age is contrary to the instructions of the Epistle to Timothy, the Didascalia Apostolorum, and several ancient canons, but that fact did not seem to bother anyone. The justice of her exalted position seems to have been universally recognized. After Chrysostom's exile she was the most important of his supporters accused of arson in the burning of the cathedral and senate house. The judge was particularly anxious to secure her admission of guilt or at least detach her from Chrysostom.⁵⁷ Both friends and enemies alike, then, admitted her capacity to wield authority.

But the most important part of Chrysostom and Olympia's relation shows up in Palladius' Dialogos 10, 35. On the day of John's exile from Constantinople we discover him bidding a very special farewell to the deaconesses and especially to Olympia. It is his last act before he departs. He tells these women that they will never see him again, and that despite all changes in bishops they are to remain faithful to the church. If his successor is not one who has plotted against him, they are to acknowledge his authority as they do John's own, and "if you wish to show your pity, remember me in your prayers." Chrysostom obviously valued the deaconesses as people and as church officers. He instructs them to remain at their jobs for the good of the church and he asks for their

57. Sozomen, Historia Ecclesiastica 8:24, in A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), II, 414-415.

prayers. It is this personal concern combined with mutual devotion to the church that makes his correspondence with Olympia so remarkable. Chrysostom wrote longer and more frequent letters to her than to any other of his many correspondents. We also possess his letters to other deaconesses only slightly less remarkable.

So finally the relation of men and women in the early church comes free from exegesis of the Bible and the structures of symbol systems. Whatever answer we finally give to the question of the ordination of women, the mutual caring we find between Chrysostom and his deaconesses outweighs any appeal to the law, tradition, or theology. All these things are man-made, but the expression of love is not.

After being tried and acquitted for arson before the city prefect and supporting John in his absence for a number of years, Olympia finally retired to Cyzicus in 405. She was, if John's letters to her are correct, broken in spirit and in health by her battles and disappointments. Sozomen says she was later exiled to Nicomedia and the group of women who gathered around her was broken up.⁵⁸ We know nothing about her end.

To illustrate the mutual concern of Olympia and Chrysostom, consider the following quote from Letter 12.

Do you see the hard struggle of accepting with serenity the absence of the one we love? This is painful and bitter; it requires a courageous and noble soul . . . To those who love each other it is not enough to be linked at soul level. This does not comfort them but they need physical presence. And if this is not granted them a great deal of their happiness is taken away from them.⁵⁹

58. Ibid., p. 415.

59. Sources chrétiennes XIII, 138. Quoted also by Tavard, p. 90.

Or this from Letter 7.1:

If you wish to write me long letters inform me of this, do not deceive me by saying that you have thrown off all despondency and are enjoying a season of rest. For letters are a remedy of the proper kind to produce great cheerfulness in thee, and you will continually see letters from me. And when you write to me again do not say, "I have much comfort from your letters," for this I know of myself but tell me that you have as much as I wish you to have, that you are not confounded with sorrows, that you do not pass your time in weeping, but in serenity and cheerfulness.⁶⁰

Another example, from Letter 12:

For the wrestlings of virtue do not depend on years or age or bodily strength, but only on the spirit and the disposition. There women have been crowned victor, while men have been upset; so also boys have been proclaimed conquerors while aged men have been put to shame.⁶¹

This last quote is especially significant because in it Chrysostom is trying to strengthen Olympia in her troubles and to do this he places her on a higher plane than most men. In terms of obedience to God there can be no distinction. Finally, we still need to realize in our relations between men and women the same respect that Chrysostom held for Olympia.

Again from Letter 12: "I also who am banished to so great a distance gain no small cheerfulness from this cause--I mean your courage."⁶²

So Chrysostom sees Olympia as superior in virtue and courage. The playfulness and concern of the second extract point toward a long and deep relationship. There are a hundred examples of the same thing that might be quoted from other letters.

Does this sort of relationship put pressure on Chrysostom's culturally inherited reasons for not ordaining women? The answer is hinted at

60. Chrysostom, IX, 296, tr. from Sources chrétiennes, Letter 7.1.

61. Chrysostom, IX, 298. See also Sources chrétiennes, XIII, Letter 12.

62. Ibid., p. 297.

in Palladius Dialogos 13. There we find evidence that if a woman proved herself capable in those areas in which she was not supposed to be capable, she was perceived as becoming masculine. The deacon Theodore wishes to know more of Olympia and asks John what country the woman is from. John retorts, "Do not say 'woman', but 'that man', because she is a man despite appearances."⁶³ Olympia is taken seriously precisely in those aspects and ways she transcends the inferior status accorded to womanhood as a cultural symbol. Here we see the symbolic attitude toward women defining the roles actual people could play. It was because women were women that they could not rule, not because women were observed to be incapable of ruling. When Olympia and other women proved themselves capable of rule and teaching and study, that in itself was taken as evidence that they needed to be seen symbolically as men. The symbol determined the person. Where the symbolic is so primary it is no wonder that the inherently symbolic position of priest is denied to those who symbolize the inferior and the incapable. But there remains the question that the ancient world did not ask, is this original symbol appropriate, were women really what they were made into by the symbolic nature placed upon them?

Since the symbol structure in Chrysostom's time said women were not to exercise important clerical office and yet women like Olympia did so, we must ask whether this symbolism was valid even in the patristic period. The tension between the culturally inherited symbolism and the reality of power held by women like Olympia is seen in texts like the one just quoted, which call certain women "virile." But calling women

63. Palladius, Dialogos, p. 98.

virile does not remove the inconsistency. If there are "virile" women and this makes them comparable with men, why not ordain them? Chrysostom sees the problem.

Woman's business is the household and the man's public affairs. But when it is a matter of faithfulness to God and his church women are often more actively energetic and courageous than men. St. Paul gives examples . . .⁶⁴

The question then becomes not whether one is a biological woman but whether one is "virile" enough. If the prohibition on ordaining women is because of some biological factor, then this should be pointed out rather than pointing to scripture, tradition, or some psychological lack like the incapacity to rule. If what prevents women's ordination is not a biological factor, why not ordain "virile" women like Olympia? Either way, Chrysostom's case is historically interesting but hardly grounds for denying ordination to women in the present day.

Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzen

I shall complete the patristic section of this paper with a few remarks on the place of women in the lives and thought of the Cappadocian Fathers. I have not discovered that any of these men actually discussed the priesthood of women, but the remarkable place of women in their lives and thought again throws into question the assumption that there is an agreed-upon Christian tradition about the natural place of woman which would prohibit her ordination.

We see in the Cappadocians the same tension between woman as symbol and woman as living person that we saw in Chrysostom. Gregory of

64. Donald Atwater, St. John Chrysostom, Pastor and Preacher (London: Harvill Press, 1959), p. 160. He is quoting Letter CXIX.

Nyssa writes in his funeral oration on St. Macrina, "We spoke of a woman, if one may refer to her as that, for I do not know if it is right to use that natural description for one who went beyond the nature of a woman."⁶⁵

What is this "nature of a woman" that real women may go beyond and why, if they do go beyond it, are they then not fit subjects for ordination? The Cappadocians do not answer.

Gregory's account of Macrina's death is especially enlightening. She is presented as the ideal philosopher, almost another Socrates, discussing the high things of the spirit as she lies dying.⁶⁶ In this dialogue, Gregory presents her as the stronger character and the more capable thinker. He even calls her his teacher, which certainly runs counter to some traditions we have seen.

One of the major thrusts of the oration is that Macrina's strength of mind is a model for all Christians. As she is also the head of a primitive sort of double monastery that includes both men and women, she can exercise authority. She also dares to argue with and criticize Gregory. Compare this with Chrysostom's idea that women lack the strength of character to become priests.⁶⁷

But Gregory says, again in the Life of St. Macrina, that talking with her as she died was almost like talking with an angel, for she "had

65. Gregory of Nyssa, "The Life of St. Macrina," in Ascetical Works (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1967), p. 163.

66. Ibid., p. 175. Gregory supposedly preserved this dialogue, On the Soul and the Resurrection; since it is self-consciously modelled on the Apology of Socrates, it is probably not the result of a real conversation. But the important thing is what Gregory thought his sister capable of and what he was willing to attribute to woman.

67. See above, p. 136.

no relation with or similarity to the life of the flesh and for whom it was not at all unreasonable to remain detached since the flesh was not part of her experience."⁶⁸ Macrina was for Gregory a woman in her flesh, but her real self was not centered there and perhaps not even active there.

Notice what this implies for the key Eastern concept of the divinization of mankind. Sexuality is to be overcome in this process, especially feminine sexuality. Are we willing to adopt as a basic reason for refusing to ordain women, a vision of human perfection that excludes feminine sexuality? A more modern view would be to say that perfection is achieved through the exercise of one's sexuality in accord with its own nature, that perfection comes from realizing the best that God has given us in that nature, not in denying it.⁶⁹ In so far as Macrina's perfection is related to her having overcome her flesh and therefore her womanhood, Gregory implies a throughgoing subordinationism beside which anything going on in the Episcopal church now pales to irrelevance. One wonders if "woman" and "flesh" are not roughly equivalent terms for Gregory.

But on the other hand, even the increasing emphasis on virginity among the Cappadocians is not a rejection of sex but an affirmation of detachment, of *ἀσέχεια*. Methodius of Olympia in the Symposium even goes so far as to say that married couples practicing all that is proper to marriage may be virgins if their offering of themselves is perfect.

68. Gregory, "Life of St. Macrina," p. 179.

69. I realize that the basic nature of this idea goes back to Aristotle, and is not modern in that sense, but it seems to me that the joyful acceptance of all the elements we discover as native to the created world is reflective of the best in modern theology.

70

Gregory edges toward the same view. The Cappadocians thus seem well on the way to emptying the realm of the church, in so far as it points to Christ, of sexual significance. These opinions of the Cappadocians offer no grounds to deny priesthood to women except social convenience. For Gregory, one's status before God is determined in the most radical way by the quality of one's self-offering.

Gregory does not support the tradition which asserts the ignorance of woman as a reason against her ordination. He pictures Macrina as summarizing for him the Stoic and Epicurean positions on the nature
71
of the soul. She is a knowledgeable and skillful theologian who is his instructor. To instruct Gregory of Nyssa in theology is no light thing.

Now Gregory of Nyssa probably did not want to ordain women, but for us the question is the coherence of his views on women with those given in the rest of the tradition. If they do not cohere, then the frequently heard claim of a universal tradition against the ordination of women is universal only in conclusion but not in the reasons advanced to justify that conclusion. In fact, Gregory's position contradicts that of many other fathers, thus throwing the whole notion of a universal Christian tradition on the place of woman into question.

Gregory's ideas do not cohere with the rest of the tradition.

Werner Jaeger says that Gregory makes Macrina into a model of the perfect
72
Christian life. There seems to me to be a tension between the ability

70. Reuther, p. 155.

71. Gregory, "Life of St. Macrina," pp. 201-203.

72. Werner Jaeger (ed.), Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature, Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius (Leiden: Brill, 1965), p. 18.

to serve as a perfect model of the Christian life and exclusion from the priesthood. Throughout the fathers this exclusion is on the grounds of being, not of calling; on the grounds of the inherent incapacity of women, not on the grounds that God just does not happen to call women. It is difficult to see how one could be a model for the Christian life and yet have some inherent defect that makes it impossible to be a priest. One could not then be a model for the male part of Christianity, where the potential of being called to the priesthood always exists.

This tension is highlighted when Gregory says that Macrina has become almost beyond the realm of flesh. If he means what he says, then all impediments based on flesh become irrelevant, including the biological fact of womanhood. I realize this sort of reasoning pushes Gregory farther than he would probably want to go. But the question before us is whether the views of the Cappadocians on the place of women allow us to assert that there is a consistent and universal Christian tradition on this topic. Such a tradition may go beyond logic, but not against logic. For us to adopt consciously an internally inconsistent tradition while we have any real options is questionable practice.

The question of his coherence with tradition is even more important because Gregory carefully founds his ideas on the place of women on the basic Christian doctrines of creation and of the nature of God. He, like Origen, sees distinction among souls as a result of the fall.⁷³ As a corollary, the rational or intellectual nature does not allow of male-female distinctions.⁷⁴ As this rational nature is for Gregory the prime

73. Jérôme Gaïth, La Conception de la liberté chez Grégoire de Nysse (Paris: Vrin, 1953), p. 127.

74. Ibid., p. 405.

means of communication with God and is the same in both men and women, there can be no inherent reason against ordaining women that depends on a difference in power of mediation or symbolic appropriateness.

Strictly speaking, it is inappropriate and almost blasphemous for a man to claim to represent God since he partakes of the fall as much as woman does. Gregory distinctly disavows the sexuality of the image of God in man. That image is of the nous and so no masculinity as such can ever be required to represent God in this world.⁷⁵

Gregory of Nazianzen's funeral oration On His Sister, St. Gorgonia, repeats many of these themes. He makes a point of the fact that she set for herself a more stringent standard of nobility than most men. His most radical statement, however, is:

Her nobility lay in the preservation of the divine image, and in her assimilation to the archetype, which is effected by reason and virtue and that pure desire, which forms ever more and more, in the things of God, those truly initiated in the heavenly mysteries, and, finally, in her knowledge of our origin, our nature, and our destiny.⁷⁶

This passage cuts against much of the traditional material opposing women's ordination that is found in the fathers. First, in Gorgonia the image of God is preserved, that is the knowledge of God is not mediated through men to women, and woman mounts toward God by reason of her own virtue and her own pure desire. The strictures of an Epiphanius that seem to assume a fundamentally different mode of relation between man and God as compared to woman and God are ignored.⁷⁷ It is also rather

75. Gregory of Nyssa, "De opificio hominis," Werner Jaeger (ed.), Opera omnia (Leiden: Brill,), Homily 16.7; Reuther, p. 154.

76. Gregory of Nazianzus, "On His Sister St. Gorgonia," in Funeral Orations by St. Gregory Nazianzus and St. Ambrose (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1953), p. 104.

77. See above, pp. 131-132.

difficult to accuse one of destroying the image of God in man if one has
⁷⁸
 preserved it in oneself. Especially interesting is the inclusion of
 reason. The Cappadocian fathers apparently believed some women capable
 of reasoning as well as men. Gorgonia is a philosopher knowing our
 "origin, nature and destiny." This is a classical description of the
 antique sage and is probably used here quite self-consciously. This
 Cappadocian tradition questions all patristic arguments based on the
 superior access of men to God because of superior rational power. When
 we consider Olympia, Macrina, Gorgonia, Anthusa, the women around Theo-
 dosia, we sense that the Cappadocians believed women capable of thinking
 clearly. This contradicts the assumption of the Didascalia that women
⁷⁹
 are incapable of explaining doctrine. Finally, the whole current
 thought pattern that women, as Origen indicated, symbolize the weakness
⁸⁰
 in humanity is implicitly questioned. I believe that we can see here
 the beginnings of a counter-tradition on the capacity of women. This
 material reveals tears and strains in the traditional notion of a uniform
 patristic picture of women. There is one piece of evidence that this
 strain was self-conscious. Gregory of Nyssa points out that Macrina had
 a secret name, Thecla. That is a self-conscious reference to and identi-
 fication with a legendary companion of Paul who cut her hair short, accom-
 panied Paul on missionary trips, preached, and baptized. To take such a
 person as a model is to assume a very positive idea of what women are
⁸¹
 capable of in the church.

78. See above, pp. 119-120.

79. See above, p. 107.

80. See above, pp. 127-128.

81. Gregory of Nyssa, Life of St. Macrina, p. 164.

The promise of the Cappadocian style is never realized, and perhaps it could not have been, but it does make impossible any appeal to the undivided reasons of the patristic writers for denying ordination to women. The only agreement among them is that women cannot be priests because Paul has forbidden them to speak in church and that it would be socially inconvenient.

Even so, the very point of the Cappadocians' writing is that women like Gorgonia and Macrina are extraordinary, in some sense against nature. But the fact that some women could go against nature is evidence that the fathers could not consistently claim an ontological bar to the ordination of women. There can be no impediment based on the nature of woman because that nature can be overcome. But for those who have overcome their "nature" as women, the question of ordination would never come up because they would never seek it; that would be a sign they were not deserving of it.

This contrast between the Cappadocians and the other fathers grows sharper when Gregory Nazianzen attributes a greater facility in the reading, explanation and recollection of the scripture to Gorgonia than⁸² to most men. That is, she objectively fulfilled the requirements for the priesthood laid down in Chrysostom's De Saec. 4:3-5.

Finally, in a passage of purple prose Gregory Nazianzen says that⁸³ Gorgonia proved "male and female a distinction of body and not of soul." How one can justify exclusion from spiritual office on the basis of bodily distinction without appeal to a biological impediment, I do not

82. Gregory Nazianzen, p. 110.

83. Ibid., p. 111.

understand. If the impediment to the ordination of women is biological, then the nature of that biological impediment needs to be made explicit and used rather than pointing at the numerous other categories of prohibition that the fathers appeal to.

So why did not the Cappadocians ordain women? The following gives some idea:

And since I have mentioned silence, I will add something especially characteristic of her, and most becoming to women, and most useful at the present time. Who knew better the things of God, both from the divine oracles and her own understanding? Further, who spoke less, confining herself within the womanly bounds of piety? And to mention the duty of a woman who has learned to be truly pious that duty alone wherein insatiate desire is a noble thing, who has so adorned not only this temple but other temples as well, with her offerings.⁸⁴

This linking of silence and piety gives a strong enough reason for the denial of priesthood to women. Yet Gregory is praising her for something we no longer demand, silence of women in church. Deacons who are women are now enjoined to preach as part of the duties laid on them in their ordination. We encourage, at least with lip service, women to become theologians, and therefore to show what to Gregory would have been a most unwomanly aggressiveness and an impious willingness to speak in public and perhaps engage in controversy with men. Yet if we accept the Cappadocians' statements about women in their own time, this seems to be the only reason they have for not ordaining women, and we have done away with it.

This does not necessarily mean that we ought to ordain women, but that any appeal to the unbroken traditions of the church against their ordination is not legitimate. In the Cappadocian fathers the split between

84. Ibid., p. 108.

the equality and unity of man and woman inherent in the best of the Christian tradition, and the presuppositions of the ancient world about the inferiority of women, come into open conflict. The task that still remains to us is to fulfill the promise of the Christian part of their theology.

EXCURSUS ON MEDIEVAL BYZANTINE CANON LAW

A large and complicated mass of material in the canon law of the church deals with women and orders. I can only hint at some interesting ideas that might be developed, and show that the study of canon law points to some reasons for the position of women in the church that one does not discover by other means. That is the reason for including this excursus. It does go beyond the time limits of the rest of the paper; but the material is inherently of great importance in the discussion of the ordination of women, and the position of the canons is not reflected in any of the writings of the church fathers we have examined. It is a most interesting fact that the canons of the Eastern church appeal to different reasons for refusing ordination to women than the theologians of the patristic period.

I concentrate on Eastern canon law, first because it is less well known than Roman, and secondly because the use of the huge mass of material on Roman canons requires special knowledge that I lack. The Eastern Orthodox church is also likely to prove the most intransigent of the churches of the Catholic tradition on this question, which makes it doubly important for Episcopalians to understand why they reject the idea and whether the rejection really has anything to do with Catholic teaching.

A word on the sources. Most westerners' knowledge of Orthodox canon law is slight, and since some of the material is not commonly available I will do considerable quoting in this section. My main source has been The Pedalion, a digest and commentary of Orthodox canon law used in several Orthodox churches up until the 1950's, at which time critical editions of the ancient canons and the medieval commentaries on them began to appear. So far as I know, these modern editions have not been translated into English; the Pedalion has. The most important material on the ordination of women comes from three medieval commentators on Eastern Orthodox canon law, John Zonaras (d. after 1160), Theodore Balsamon (ca. 1105-1195), and Matthew Blastaris (d. after 1300).¹

The history of canonical impediments to women acting in the church goes back to the mid-third century, but it is extremely difficult to be sure that any particular canon is actually written by the figure to whom it is attributed. In those instances where I have been able to check the Pedalion, it has been accurate; its statements of the content of the canons and the commentaries on them match with the Latin translations in the Patrologia Graecae and also with Berkeley's edition of Photius' Nomocanon.

1. The sections of the commentaries of these men relevant to the ordination of women may be found in Greek with Latin translations in Patrologia Graecae at the following locations: Balsamon and Zonaras, CXXXVIII: col. 466-67, Canon 2, Dionysios of Alexandria; Blastaris CXLIV: col. 1090, Canon 2, Dionysios of Alexandria; Balsamon and Zonaras, CXXXVIII: col. 468-470, Canon 3, Dionysios of Alexandria; Balsamon and Zonaras, CXXXVII: col. 302-307, Canon 19, First Ecumenical Council at Nicaea; Balsamon and Zonaras, CXXXVII: col. 753-756, Canon 70, Council in Trullo (6th Ecumenical); Balsamon and Zonaras, CXXXVII: col. 1399-1400, Canon 44, Synod of Laodicea. This list is selective, not exhaustive. The scholar interested in further checking will find other similar examples.

It is important that the particular canons I will discuss are also those appealed to by Nicolai Chitescu in his article in Concerning the Ordination of Women² published by the World Council of Churches. The fact that these particular canons are still binding on the Orthodox influences the ecumenical aspect of this problem.

The earliest canon we have dealing with the position of women in the church is Canon II of Dionysios of Alexandria. It is one of a series of answers to questions which Basilides, Bishop of the Pentapolis, directed at Dionysios, metropolitan of Northern Egypt. The two topics discussed are the duration of Lent and the material conditions for the reception of eucharist.³

The canon runs:

Concerning menstuous women, whether they ought to enter the temple of God while in such a state, I think it superfluous even to put the question. For, I opine, not even they themselves, being faithful and pious, would dare when in this state either to approach the Holy Table or to touch the body and blood of Christ. For not even the woman with the twelve years' issue would come into actual contact with him, but only with the edge of his garment, to be cured. There is no objection to one's praying no matter how he may be or to one's remembering the Lord at any time and in any state whatsoever, and petitioning to receive help; but if one is not wholly clean in both soul and body, he shall be prevented from coming up to the Holy of Holies.⁴

It is interesting that the Didascalia has a different interpretation of the same story of the woman with the twelve years' issue of blood.

2. Nicolai Chitescu, "The Ordination of Women," in Concerning the Ordination of Women (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1964), pp. 57-60.

3. J. Quasten, Patrology (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1950), II, 106.

Martiniano Roncaglia, Histoire de l'Eglise Copte (Liban: Dar-al-Kalima, 1966), II, 226-227.

4. Agapius and Nicodemus, Pedalion (Chicago: Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1957), p. 714. See also Ante-Nicene Christian Fathers, VI, 96.

In like manner also you shall not separate those (women) who are in their wonted courses; for she also who had the flow of blood was not chidden when she touched the skirt of our saviour's cloak, but was even vouchsafed the forgiveness of all her sins. Wherefore, a woman when she is in the way of women . . . let them assemble without restraint, without washing, for they are clean.⁵

For Dionysios it seems as if the woman has an almost mana-like quality; if she gets too close to the eucharistic elements she will somehow destroy or threaten God's presence. The canon breathes horror of the pollution of menstruation in contrast to the holiness of the eucharist that could easily account for the failure of women to be priests if this is not an isolated example.

The commentator Zonaras quotes Leviticus 15:19 and 15:25 to justify this canon. He goes on to give three reasons why menstruating women are unclean: 1. It is the natural response of mankind to hold them in abhorrence. 2. The uncleanness of natural and involuntary actions teaches us how much more unclean conscious sins are, so that we learn to abhor them properly. 3. To prevent sexual intercourse during menstruation and the consequent conception of weak and unhealthy children. This last reason points to an outmoded biology which believed that the blood of the mother was her contribution to the making of a new being, while the father provided the vital principle and the form. The reasons are then summarized:

So for all these reasons, wishing to instill reverence and fear not only into women, but much more into the impetuous vehemence of the natural instinct of men, both of old and now again through his saints, God has prohibited these women from coming

5. Didascalia Apostolorum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), p. 254. This chapter has a sweeping and effective attack on all Old Testament legislation concerning cultic cleanness.

into the temple proper and partaking of the divine mysteries, just as this canon of the divine father decrees.⁶

It is interesting that the compilers of the Pedalion were under some pressure from people who pointed out the sweeping attacks in some places in patristic literature on the purification rites of the Jews.⁷ The specific source is the Didascalia Apostolorum mentioned above. In dealing with this attack the compilers of the Pedalion first point out that the Didascalia does not give a positive commandment to women who are menstruating to take eucharist, but only to pray. There are texts, they admit, that mention the eucharist, but only as a gloss. This defense ignores the fact that the women were, according to the Didascalia, not to be prevented from assembling; and in the third century when this document was written there were few other services except eucharist for which they could assemble. It also ignores the general nature of the attack on purification rites:

But if there be any who are precise and desire, after the Second Legislation [the law given after the Golden calf was made as contrasted to the ten commandments, given before. J.G.] to observe the wonted courses of nature and issues and marriage intercourse: first let them know that, as we have already said, together with the Second Legislation they affirm the curse against our Saviour and condemn themselves to no purpose. And again, let them tell us, in what days or in what hours they keep themselves from prayer and from receiving the Eucharist, or from reading scripture--let them tell us whether they are void of the Holy Spirit. For through baptism they receive the Holy Spirit, who is ever with those that work righteousness, and does not

6. Pedalion, p. 719. Balsamon concurs in this; he knows that the question is whether certain Jewish customs should be observed and concludes that they should be.

7. Didascalia Apostolorum, pp. 242-56. I am not sure whether the medieval commentators were working with the expanded versions of this called the Apostolic Constitutions or not. It does not make much difference because all the material I use here was present for the medieval commentator to work with and the important thing was what they saw fit to emphasize.

depart from them by reason of natural issues and the intercourse of marriage, but is ever and always with those who possess Him . . .⁸

That is a fairly sweeping attack that the medieval Byzantine canonists deal with by ignoring.

The second argument used by Zonaras is worth noting also:

We reply to them [those who wish to do away with restrictions concerning menstruating women and worship, J.G.] with this true and surer answer that we have but one obligation, to obey and to follow the canons with implicit obedience, and not to sit as judges and examiners of what has been commanded by the Holy Spirit, and to keep saying why this? and why that? lest we incur the exceedingly horrible penalties imposed upon those transgressing the canons.⁹

That is a fairly firm attempt to close off rational discussion.

There are many more canons that can be quoted to say practically the same thing as Dionysios of Alexandria. But the Pedalion goes on to draw the connection between menstruation and the refusal of orders to women in a very explicit way. The question being discussed is the reordination of converts from the Paulinists, Canon 19 of the First Ecumenical Council at Nicaea in 325. The question is whether deaconesses converted to the Orthodox faith also need to be re-instituted into their order like the clerics. In the middle of a long note on the history of deaconesses Balsamon remarks that they once had a rank in the Bema [sanctuary] but that the complications due to menstruation dispossessed¹⁰ them of their service in the Bema and removed them from their rank.

Later on in the same note there is a quotation from Blastaris to the same effect. This indicates that at least the medieval Greeks understood that

8. Ibid., p. 42.

9. Pedalion, p. 720.

10. Ibid., p. 195.

the reason women were not permitted to fill liturgical functions was casually connected with menstruation. This twelfth and thirteenth century opinion may not apply in earlier Christianity, but the fact that as early as the third century Dionysios was forbidding Holy Communion to menstruating women indicates a very long continued tradition of the separation of menstruating women and holy things. If one believes this tradition, it would constitute the strongest and most universally applicable sort of case against the ordination of any women at all.

The plainest supporting evidence of this comes from the Questions and Answers of Timothy of Alexandria, also authoritative Orthodox canons.

Question 6 reads:

If a woman who is a catechumen has given her name in order to be enlightened [baptised], and on the day appointed for the baptism she incurs the plight which regularly afflicts women, ought she to be enlightened on that day, or defer, and how long ought she to defer.¹¹

The answer is that she ought to defer until she has been purified. Question 7 asks the same question about the reception of eucharist and receives the same answer. This confirms the situation pictured by Dionysios. The dating of the Canons of Timothy is in some doubt for me, but at least by the time of the Council of Quinisext, 692, these canons were authoritative for all the Eastern church, as the second canon of that synod lists the authoritative canons and these are among them.

11. Ibid., p. 893. Timothy flourished ca. 372 as Archbishop of Alexandria. The text of his canons is given in the Appendix to Vol. XIV of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd series, pp. 612-13. I think the ascription of these canons to this Timothy needs some caution; I can find no reference to him as the author of canons in any standard patrology. Quinisext attributes them to Timothy of Alexandria, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, XIV, 361. Chitescu also accepts this attribution.

Canon 17 of John the Faster says that if a woman does take communion during her menstrual period she shall go without communion 40 days. Other than that women are merely to avoid communion while menstruation is occurring.¹² Canon 17 of John the Faster reads:

As for women occupying a separate seat, let them not touch holy things for as many as seven days, as the second Canon of St. Dionysios but in particular the seventh canon of Timothy bids. This is also what the old Law ordered, but neither did it permit them to have any sexual intercourse with men; for it happens on this account that the seeds sown become weak and evanescent. Hence it was that divine Moses ordered the father of a defective [child] to be stoned to death on the ground that on account of his intemperance he failed to await the purification of his wife. But as for a woman who has been so scornful of the same uncleanness during this period and has touched the divine mysteries, they bid her to remain communionless for forty days.¹³

Notice that John is conscious of being part of a tradition on this matter; he appeals to Dionysios and Timothy to support his own position. We see the usual theme: the touch of a menstruating woman pollutes the eucharistic elements in what seems almost a magical way. This prohibition is grounded ultimately on the Old Testament legislation.

The Synod of Laodicea, in the mid-fourth century, prohibited women¹⁴ from approaching the altar (Canon 44). The canon itself does not specify menstruation as the cause of this restriction, but such was assumed by the medieval commentators. Zonaras says:

12. Ibid., p. 941.

13. Ibid., p. 941. John the Faster died in 595 and had been Archbishop of Constantinople since 582. He was famous for being the first to assume the title ecumenical patriarch and on that account engaged in conflict with Rome. His canons are considered authoritative, although he is sometimes accused of making the penalties of sin too easy to meet. See art. in the New Catholic Encyclopedia and the introduction to his canons in the Pedalion.

14. "Canons of the Synod of Laodicea," in P. Schaff (ed.), A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), XIV, 153.

If it is prohibited to laymen to enter the sanctuary by the LXIXth Canon of Quinisext, much more are women forbidden to do so who are unwillingly indeed, but yet truly polluted by the monthly flux of blood.¹⁵

The sense of ritual uncleanness is thus important early in church history. I have found no prohibition of women from any office or act in the church of the first two centuries. Thereafter, there is a constant tradition of the exclusion of women from office, permanently, and from the sacraments while they are menstruating. In the light of the examples I have quoted and the examples collected in van der Meer that illustrate the same practice in the West, one can only conclude that menstruation would be conceived as polluting the office of priest as it would pollute the bread and the wine.¹⁶ If menstruation pollutes the occasional holy service of eucharist it would also pollute the permanent holy state of priesthood.

This prohibition of women from eucharist while they were menstruating was nearly universal by the early middle ages. The Oriental church, the Orthodox and the Catholic West all have canons prohibiting the entrance of women into the sanctuary, reception of communion while menstruating, and ordination, whether as priest or deacon. I will take a few examples from van der Meer to give the flavor of these prohibitions in the West and then quote some from the Oriental churches.

When a priest celebrates the Mass, women in general should not approach the altar but remain in their places; and the priest should accept their gifts there in order to bring them afterwards to God; for the women should be conscious of their own weakness and the weakness of their sex; and therefore they must scrupulously guard that they do not touch anything consecrated to the

15. Ibid., p. 153.

16. Haye van der Meer, Women Priests in the Catholic Church? (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1973), Chapter 4.

service of the church. The male laity must also be scrupulously on guard lest they endure the punishment of Uzza, who, because he wished to touch God's ark in extraordinary circumstances, perished by the hand of God.¹⁷

That women consecrated to God or nuns touch the holy vessels or consecrated eucharistic linens and carry the incense around the altar has been reported to the Holy See. That this is full of every reprehension and vituperation is not doubted by any right-thinking person. For this reason we believe on the basis of the authority of the Holy See that you should put a stop to these actions entirely and as soon as possible: and so that this plague does not spread further through all provinces, we command that it be abolished with all haste.¹⁸

Notice the almost mana-like quality ascribed to women. The first quotation is from Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans in Gaul (d. 821). The second is a forgery, purportedly a decree of Pope Soter. It was used by Gratian in forming the Canon law on the topic in the west [see the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, D. 23, c. 23]. The text was probably invented for use in the Gallic conflict over deaconesses.

For the Oriental church, I have chosen a series of canons from West Syria, translated by A. Vööbus, ranging from the early sixth century to almost 800. Canon 11.6 of John bar Qursos, Bishop of Tella, 519-38 permits women to come to the church to pray but not to enter into the sanctuary.¹⁹ Canon 43 of the Synod of Qyruaqos of Antioch prohibits the reception of eucharist during menstruation but permits women to attend church during that time (794).²⁰ Other examples are canons (from anonymous collections of the same church) that prohibit deaconesses from going

17. *Ibid.*, p. 96.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 91; see also *Patrologia Graecae*, V, c. 1136.

19. A. Vööbus, *Syrische Kanonessammlungen* (Louvain: University of Louvain Press, 1970), I, 158.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

inside the altar area during menstruation although at other times they
 21
 may wash the sacred vessels.

All of this points to the ancient sense that woman was flawed during menstruation. It is easy to see why a community that accepted this sort of thinking would be unwilling to ordain women priests. I do not say that menstruation taboos are the main reason why the early church did not permit women to become priests, but the degree to which they were important needs to be investigated more thoroughly. How widespread were these prohibitions? Most of the canons I have found come from people with monastic backgrounds. Did the more secular world have a different opinion? (I doubt it; I have discovered no evidence of a different viewpoint from the secular clergy, but then I have discovered precious little evidence from them at all.)

So there are lots of unanswered questions. But for our present discussion we must ask if we wish the church to subscribe to a tradition that self-consciously bases itself on a sort of obedience to Old Testament Law that is contrary to the Western and Protestant understanding of freedom in Christ.

In order to preserve the tradition of the non-ordination of women in any rational way we need either to espouse the reasons for its originally becoming authoritative, or we need to find other reasons. In the light of this canonical evidence it seems to me incontrovertible that menstruation taboos have some place in Christian tradition as a reason for the exclusion of women from office. Chitescu admits that this is part of the tradition in the Orthodox church, but apparently feels uneasy

21. Ibid., pp. 267, 559.

about it, for in his article for Concerning the Ordination of Women when he says there is a time that women are "impure," the quotation²² marks are his. He does not explain them. He quite straightforwardly states that this is a reason for denying the priesthood to women. His only other reason is that "our Lord did not include any women among the twelve or the seventy to whom he gave power to perform the sacraments."²³ We have seen how valid that argument is (see above, p. ff.).

It may be that the primitive fears of the mysteries of women and menstruation are still lurking in the Episcopal church. But to self-consciously surrender to those fears, and appeal to a tradition based on them as a reason for action now, and then to claim we are following the guidance of the Spirit seems to me a bit arrogant.

22. Chitescu, p. 58.

23. Ibid.

CHAPTER VI

THEOLOGICAL SPECULATIONS AND CAUTIONS

If the work of Christ is the model for the work of the priesthood, then we may ask if there are any especially masculine or feminine components to his work. One caution that needs to be expressed is that the work of Christ is also determinative of that work the entire church does. He is the model for the laity as well as the clergy, and women also take Jesus for their model in living a Christian life. So we must be very careful to attach the gender to the function in some necessary way if we are to establish that there is any sexual division of labor in the Christian life at all, to say nothing of the priesthood.

Traditionally, Christ's work has been seen as a special relation to God and as the various acts that were manifestations of that relation. One may search the Gospels from end to end and not find any acts of Jesus or of the disciples that require a certain sex; one may find acts, like teaching, that were only done by males in the time of Jesus, but circumstances have changed and women now teach. This situation is reflected in the fact that the church knows no sacraments that depend in their roots on the distinction between masculine and feminine in their symbol structure. Christianity had no mystical marriage to the deity

at all in its early years, but rather sacraments of eating and drinking and of washing or cleansing. These have remained the primary expressions of Christ's presence with us for the majority of Christians. Galatians 3:28 expressly forbids all sexual distinctions in baptism and what results from it. The separation frequently found in Christian history of men and women at eucharist has always been for reasons of social propriety, not theological necessity.

Now eating, drinking and washing are universal human activities that mark our common humanity, not our sexual distinctness. Even marriage as a sacrament, which has definite roles for men and women that do depend on their sex, aims to transcend sexual distinction into a new unity in which the difference is preserved but incorporated into a higher completeness. Besides, in marriage the members of the couple minister to each other, mediate grace to each other. The priestly role is not strictly masculine here. Since the misconception that the priest marries the couple is so commonly held, the distinction must be made clear between the marrying, which the couple do themselves, and the blessing of the marriage, which is pronounced by the priest expressly in Christ's name and as his agent. Whether or not a woman can do this is open as long as the total question of women priests is open. While the marriage itself may require sexual distinction, this is not yet evidence either that the blessing of the marriage does, or that the priestly function is confined to the male. It is, in fact, evidence of the opposite. The actions of Christ on which all the sacraments are based allow no distinctions of sex.

Christ represents his relation to the Father in absolutely universal terms: eating and drinking, being baptized, foot washing,

teaching, going to parties, praying, suffering, dying. These are the things about Jesus the Evangelists consider important enough to record. Not one requires a particular sex. If Jesus is the full revelation of God for us, then the sexual aspects of that relation and fullness are remarkably slight. He was a male, just as he was a Jew and a carpenter, but neither of these factors appears to place a limit upon his relation with the Father and therefore on our relation with Him. Indeed, the origin of the notion of Christian priesthood seems to be rooted in the complete self-giving of the Son to the Father that takes place in the Trinity. This means that at the roots the model for the priesthood has nothing to do with sexuality at all unless we want to incorporate sex into the very unity and diversity of the Godhead. And most Christian tradition has avoided that like the plague.

Sexual metaphors have been freely used to discuss both the relations internal to the Godhead and those between God and his people--begetting, filiation, fatherhood, sonship, kingship. As long as these masculine analogies are used to describe a being inherently neither masculine nor feminine or inherently the fullness of both, it would be very strange to emphasize the special sexual aspects of the analogy. In other words, if, as Paul says, "all who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God" (Romans 8:14), it is ridiculous to emphasize the sexual aspects of the analogy. Since presumably women too receive the Spirit and thus become 'sons', we must beware of saying women cannot perform the core functions that grow from masculine-sounding analogies.¹

1. There are other examples of the rather deceptive generic use of the word 'sons' in Paul, especially in Galatians 4.

If we insist that only men may be priests because only they can represent Christ adequately, we come perilously close to incorporating sexuality into the very nature of God. We also confuse theological metaphor with biological reality, the basic problem in all anthropomorphic heresies.

Here I wish to pose a methodological question. If the priest stands in the place of Christ and therefore must have some parallels with Christ to symbolize Him, then we need some grounds for deciding which parallels are significant and which are irrelevant. We need, in other words, some method which will allow us to say that Jewishness is inessential while mercy is essential. Even here we need to be careful not to fall into a species of Donatism. If masculinity is essential for the valid consecration of the eucharist, the effectiveness of the sacrament seems to be made dependent on something other than the action of God and the willing reception of the believer. Ordinary Donatism claimed that the validity of the sacraments depended on the worthiness of the ministers; in this case it depends on the sex of the ministers. No discussion of the ordination of women I have seen has shown how the sex of a woman who invokes the Holy Spirit to make the bread and wine as body and blood of Christ for a congregation could prevent God from doing just that. There is no inherent incapacity in either women or in laymen which by its very nature and existence would prevent them from consecrating the sacrament. All members of the community are potential eucharistic priests, but their potentiality by nature needs to be made actual by the call of the Spirit and the endorsement of the community.

This is important because many people discussing this question say that God does not like or wish women to consecrate, and then they look in

the Bible or in Christian tradition or in the supposed orders of creation to determine what God does not like. But they do not point out what in the nature or destiny of women as a class prevents them from functioning as priests. If God does not want women to consecrate the elements, or ordain people to priestly office, He probably has a reason, for He may be a mystery, but He is not a capricious mystery. The fact that the question has not been asked leads me to wonder if it can be answered. At any rate, there will be no clear settlement of the issue in favor of the negative until some impediment is found that rationally prevents women from representing the action of Christ among us.

There is some question if such an impediment can be found, since the Anglican Communion, at least, allows women to baptize and to preach with authority. That is, we already allow women to represent the actions of Christ among us in a public and symbolic way in these two areas, and for our position to be consistent there must be some distinction between the representing of Christ here and the representing of Christ in the eucharist, in blessings and in ordination. A priest shares Christ's priesthood, so deacons, even women deacons, are His agents and share His diaconate.² I have not seen anyone attempt to establish such a distinction between Christ's priesthood in the eucharist and in baptizing.

There is another question that relates to the priest's symbolic role. Not only does he represent Christ to the people, but he also represents the people before Christ. The question of whether a female can represent Christ has been asked many times; the question of whether

2. William J. Wolf, "A Reply to Bishop Meyers on the Ordination of Women," Journal of Ecumenical Studies, IX, 232.

a male can fully represent the congregation to God has received much less attention. It would seem to me that if the symbolism will work one way and not the other, some extraordinary reasons for that must be adduced, especially since in symbolizing the people, the church, the priest assumes what has been thought of as basically a feminine symbol. I see no reason why our symbolism of Christ needs to be more coherent than our symbolism of the church.

Besides, there are symbols of God that are feminine. Wisdom in the book of Proverbs is a woman and the Spirit of God; the Third Person of the Trinity is described either in feminine or neuter terms, depending on whom you read. The Spirit is described in Gregory of Nyssa, for instance, in basically feminine terms. So the real question is not whether the symbols for God have or have not been masculine, but whether the nature of the incarnation is necessarily masculine.

Even if the argument could be established that God has chosen no feminine symbols, the negative stance on the ordination of women is not thereby justified. Arguments from silence are dangerous--only one counter-example negates them, and in this case there needs to be shown not only that there have been no legitimate feminine symbols for God or Christ in the past, but that there can be none in the future and that therefore there cannot be one now. That would be most difficult to prove.

But it becomes really problematic to insist on masculine symbols for Christ when we remember that almost everything Christian tradition has classically wanted to say about God was performed as part of male roles when it was discovered to be an analogy for God. In the ancient world the Jews discovered a God who combined both caring love and authority. What symbols were available in that world to represent such a

combination? "Shepherd, priest, king, judge, were all male roles in the ancient world."³ Because of the structure of society in the ancient world there were no feminine symbols that said what needed to be said about God. That God did not choose a non-existent symbol to represent himself is hardly surprising, but that the church today should limit its symbolic understanding of God to those symbols drawn from a culture 2500 years old is surprising.

Whenever we are faced with a symbol for God the question is what is the core notion or actuality the symbol is intended to communicate? Symbols like that of kingship, for instance, are like parables. They intend to communicate one basic point. They are not allegories where every descriptive element of the symbol has to correspond to part of that which is symbolized. Because God is king does not mean he wears golden robes. It may not even mean he is masculine. But it does say something of the sort of authority and responsibility God exercises. To assume in the face of this fact that God chose these male symbols because they were male is difficult. They were also all that was available.

The understanding and consequently the symbolic structures of the human expression of Divine revelation is limited by the nature of the symbolic roles available. It may be that some ages are really incapable of grasping all God would like to say to them because their symbolic structures are not broad or deep enough. As the nature of the available symbols changes, the expression and understanding of the content of revelation will alter. It may be God wills to show us a more adequate

3. Linwood Urban, "A Dialogue Concerning the Ordination of Women," (Paper presented to the conference of Anglican Theologians, Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, Ill., April 2-5, 1975), p. 15.

symbolism for Himself that escapes the fact that earlier ages were incapable of understanding Him fully because a combination of intimacy and authority could only be expressed in masculine imagery. An imagery of the fullness of humanity as inclusive of male and female and still combining tenderness and intimacy with authority would, perhaps, have been more appropriate if people had been capable of seeing it as a symbol rather than just an anomaly. So the fact that there are no known women priests in the tradition may be more a judgment on our blindness and sin than a revelation of God's will. If we are to assert that the failure to appoint women as priests is divine revelation, this must be supported by some convincing and fundamental arguments.

Finally, my core concern. Women certainly exercise the office of priest as it is found in the priesthood of all believers. How does the formally appointed office of priest differ from the priesthood of all believers? In the latter it is counted as laudable for women to perform the priestly office of sacrifice, but in the former it is forbidden. What is the conflict between the fundamental nature of woman and the fundamental nature of the formally ordained priesthood? If there is no conflict, where does the deeper unity lie that allows this office to be open to both male and female? Each of these questions requires its own thesis, but I will sketch some answers here.

First, Christian priesthood is one of offering sacrifice. The origin of this sacrifice is the sacrificial life and death of Jesus. This life is the culmination of all sacrifice whatsoever, because Jesus' life and death are not substitute offerings put in place of something else, but are offered in and for themselves. It was, for Jesus, a complete offering; there is nothing more that could have been given. We

repeat this sacrifice, not in the sense of actually resacrificing Jesus of Nazareth, but in the sense that as part of the body of Christ we offer ourselves as His body, with the same completeness as he used in first offering Himself. His sacrifice is therefore in a very real way continued in us as the individual and communal offering by which the Church offers itself as the body of Christ in this world. This offering of praise and thanksgiving, which is our entire life, is not just the worship service on Sunday or any other day, but the very substance and matter of a worshipping life. The offering of one's whole life, including one's death, as an individual and also in community, is pre-eminently the nature of Jesus' sacrifice, and the demand the New Testament places upon us is for this sort of sacrifice--not as we are ordained publicly as priests but as we are baptized as Christians.

In this we partake of Jesus' priesthood; we do not create a priesthood for ourselves. So we cannot make any distinctions between men and women in this form of priesthood, and this form of priesthood is that of Jesus. We are again faced with the question that since women derive their participation in the universal priesthood from Christ, on what grounds do we make an exception for the special and more limited priesthood of the publicly-appointed priest, one of whose specific purposes is to represent that Christ from whom women also learn to offer the priestly sacrifice of their souls and bodies?

The question is important because the priesthood of the formally-ordained and publicly-appointed priest is not different from that of the priesthood of all believers. The formally ordained priest is a mirror in which the congregation sees symbolically reflected that which they really are. The eucharistic service is the symbolic presentation of the truth

of all moments of existence--a symbol which, because God is active in it as in all other moments, partakes of the reality of that which it symbolizes, the action of God in the world and in our lives. The priest's part in the service partakes of this symbolic nature. The congregation cannot substitute itself for the priest because they cannot mirror themselves. The priesthood then includes both identification with the congregation and distance from it. The identification comes from being part of the reality, the distance is that of a symbol which summarizes and presents something in a visible and highlighted way, while still partaking of its nature.

When the priest offers the total life of the Christian community to God under the form of bread and wine, prayer and praise, he does nothing more than what we do everyday of our lives, only he does it in a symbolic form that calls us to remember who we really are. He cannot, therefore, celebrate without laity present, for his priesthood is incomplete without the priesthood of the laity present to give his symbolic priesthood real priesthood to symbolize.

So the power of the eucharist comes from the visible and symbolic representation of the sacrifice and redemption that is always taking place in our lives. In so far as women live out their lives as Christians, they live a life of full eucharistic priesthood every bit as real as what their formally-appointed male brothers in Christ do on Sunday morning. At present they are only prevented from symbolizing in public and for the community that which takes place in the reality of their own lives all the time.

This changes the form of the question again. Is there any reason why women can do eucharist but not symbolize it? If there is, it would

indicate that the nature of mediation found in eucharistic symbolism is in itself exclusively masculine. In other words, masculinity becomes necessary to symbolize Christ, but not to be Christ in this world. That is a very strange stance.

Now it is axiomatic in Catholic sacramental doctrine that Christ is the chief minister in all sacraments. Much of the negative discussion of women's ordination has hinged on the idea that Jesus of Nazareth was a man, therefore the chief representative of Him in the symbolic acts of the community also has to be a man for the sake of coherence in the symbolism. To give an example of one form this argument may take, consider that of John R. Sheets in the January 1975 American Ecclesiastical Review.⁴ He claims that Jesus was masculine and the priest must be masculine because masculinity symbolizes effectiveness in bringing about union, and femininity attraction in bringing about union. That the symbol is appropriate to the factual status of men and women is never proven. Sheets' scheme would seem to require all men to be priests and the whole of the congregation to be women.

But in every sacrament the nature of that which does the representing must partake of the nature of that which it represents, not in a complete and absolute way, but only in what is essential for the effect of the sacrament. It is not necessary for us to imitate Jesus but only to represent those elements of his action and being that have saving power for us. No one, so far as I know, has argued that masculinity was essential to the saving work of Christ. Indeed, Paul, when speaking of the saving work Christ accomplished, uses the generic term *ἀνθρώπων*

4. John R. Sheets, "Ordination of Women: The Issues," American Ecclesiastical Review, CLXIX:1 (1975), 16-36.

in, for instance, Romans 5:15. The Christian "growing up into the stature of the new man" is ἀνθρώπος. The masculine word ⁵ἀνὴρ was available to Paul, but he scrupulously avoided it. Phillipians 2:8 talks of Christ taking human form. The church fathers do not discuss the question of whether the humanity that Jesus assumed in the incarnation had to be masculine humanity. I cannot quote statements that were not made, but I do invite the reader to check for himself any standard text on the history of patristic Christology, such as Grillmeier or Prestige, and try to discover any indication that the incarnation was conceived as necessarily masculine rather than an incarnation in human nature. In the Christological controversies the question is not even raised whether the logos must be incarnated as a male. Some moderns have raised the question, but they are not grounded in tradition when ⁶they do so.

It is not fair to say that the fathers assumed that such incarnation would have to be as a male. Perhaps that is true, but then they should have used masculine language when they talked about the nature of the relation between the divine and the human in Christ, and they do not. At least the most careful statements, like the Chalcedonian Creed and the work of the Cappadocian fathers, do not. Their language is scrupulously neuter. The real problem for them was how God could become a person at all, not whether he must be a male or a female one.

All this points to a severe difficulty in making a negative case.

5. This is opposed to all feeling in the ancient world that perfection of character is masculine. The fact that Paul uses generic language in this context assumes unusual significance and points to a self-conscious choosing of the neuter terms.

6. Sheets, p. 28.

If God must be incarnated as a male for his saving power to be effective, rather than as a human being who happens to be a male, then maleness has some special capacity to receive or transmit grace. The male would make a better mediator. That indicates a fundamental split in the human race in respect to their mode of relation with God, males having an easier time relating to God than females, since they are more capable of receiving grace, or at least more capable of transferring and symbolizing it to others. But all through Christian theology, beginning with Irenaeus, there is the assumption that Christ became man in order to save mankind, that what is not assumed in Christ cannot be saved. So we are saved in and through our humanness as Christ's humanness, not our maleness or femaleness. If we were saved by our sexuality and Christ had become primarily or essentially a male for the purpose of salvation, he would save males. If there is this deep split between man and woman, and Christ only assumed masculinity in order to better receive and transmit grace, there is either no way for woman to be saved, or it is at least much harder for her to be saved than for man. Another way to say this is that if the priest represents the masculinity of Jesus, can he at the same time represent his full humanity? If he can, then it is strange that he can represent both male and female and the woman cannot. If he cannot represent women, then Christ did not die to save them, an utterly abhorrent conclusion. The very assumption that man has some characteristic that makes it possible for him to mediate grace more easily than woman militates against woman's being able to receive that mediated grace in the first place.

To ask the question from another angle, what is the defect or lack in the character of woman that prevents her from symbolizing the saving

work of Christ? Many arguments against woman priests implicitly start from this question but never get around to answering it. For instance, for the fact that Jesus chose no women disciples to have any meaning other than his social conditioning, there must be some characteristic of woman qua woman that makes it inappropriate for her to perform this function. All use of authority and church tradition to either support or reject the priesthood of women points back to this question. Merely to use tradition without dealing with the theological and philosophical questions tradition raises, can end in sheer tyranny by the past, or worse, by one interpretation of the past. One can quote passages from the fathers ad infinitum about the unsuitability of woman for priestly office, but the argument is not convincing until the impediment itself is pointed out and its exact nature explored, including the exact nature of what must fail to happen if a woman were to attempt to consecrate that must happen if the sacrament is to be effective.

To claim to construct a permanent prohibition against women priests on any basis less than this is to assume that all revelation of the Holy Spirit on this matter is to be found in the past and that He will never speak on the issue again. This sort of second guessing of the action of the Spirit is very dangerous, if not blasphemous, and comes from trusting the past merely because it is the past. Our right to elevate the fact of Jesus' masculinity into an ontological fact from an historical and contingent one needs to be carefully proven--not assumed.

In Hebrews (8:6) the mediation of Christ is said to surpass that of the old covenant because the promises of the new covenant are more complete. The price of this new covenant is paid by Jesus' very being. The superiority of the new covenant is that the law will be written on

the minds and hearts of his people. There is no mention of masculinity or femininity; in fact, the very point of Hebrews is that the old priesthood, with its hereditary exclusiveness, its exclusiveness of women, gentiles, and children has all been overthrown in Christ. The nature of God's promise to the church and the world, and the guarantee of the promise, the sacrifice of Jesus, have no obvious connection with sexuality. Women obviously have received the Spirit, and participate in Jesus' sacrifice. All the fathers are agreed in confining sexuality to this world. It seems that the promise of salvation, the Kingdom of God, is open to both men and women and there, in God's presence, they will be equal. It is also true that the distance between our world and the Kingdom is one of the ways we grieve our Lord. One purpose of the church is to represent the Kingdom in the fallen world. Therefore, in the church more than anywhere else, the conditions of the kingdom should prevail. The freedom from social barriers and unnecessary restrictions on functions ought to be greater in the church than anywhere else. To enter the Kingdom one needs first to receive the promise; everyone assumes that women enter the Kingdom, therefore they have received the promise and the Spirit that carries it. That women have imitated Christ's sacrifice cannot be doubted; even the most misogynist of the fathers, men like Jerome and Tertullian, see self-sacrifice as a peculiar virtue of women.

The conclusion seems clear: the structure of Christian doctrine, at least as it relates to the nature of God and the incarnation, allows us to ordain women. It does not require us to do so, but we are free in this matter so far as the structural requirements of the doctrines are concerned.

But there is a contingent reason why I think women should be ordained. The church now needs to beware of making any one part of itself the sole mediator between the human race and God. Apostles, priests, laypeople, children, all are witnesses to and share in the mediating function of the one mediator, Christ. Without his mediation witnessed to by the whole community, there is none for us through any special part of the community. Yet there is the terrible temptation to see the priest as the sole mediator and the laity as the passive receivers of the mediation not only in the formal church services but also in the world. To meet this I believe we need to make the formal priesthood as broad as possible and so help to destroy every vestige of the notion that priestly sacrifice is something that the ordinary laity do not do in their own way and place. To continue with only masculine priests tends to support the belief that they are possessed of some special capacity to do something for the congregation that the congregation could never do for itself. Furthermore, it supports the belief that this unnamed special thing is dependent on the masculinity of the priest and not on the sacrifice of Christ. It is part, in a small way, of the assumption that priests are, of necessity, especially religious people, and that they do Christian living for the laity for whom there is another standard. To put this in another way, the assumption is that priests are special in themselves, for what they are, rather than that they are special because what they represent is special. It is to help rid ourselves of this misconception that I support the ordination of women.

There is one more idea of some interest. If we only partake of or represent Jesus' mediation between ourselves and the Father, if the

formally ordained priests are Christ's priests and not Christs in their own right, then if masculinity is essential to priestly mediation, it is Jesus' masculinity and not that of the priest. I propose that if the "masculinity" necessary for redemption is understood as sonship to God, or as Christ's masculinity, then all Christians are "male" because we partake of Christ's masculinity as we do of the effectiveness of his sacrifice. After all, the ordained priest does not do again what Jesus did once for all for us. But by the recreation of the meanings of His life and death in the eucharist we all minister the benefits of Christ to each other. The priest takes the part of Christ in this drama not in virtue of his own power, but Christ's power. The masculinity of Christ then, would be sufficient for his priest if such masculinity were necessary for the effectiveness of the sacrament at all, just as Christ's sacrifice and his virtue and power are sufficient for the priest. If the priest must have masculinity in his own right for the sacrament to be effective, but not virtue or sacrifice, then this means that the eucharist is not dependent on Christ but on human sexuality. That is blasphemous heresy.

EPILOGUE

In the preceding pages I have tried to examine, in their historical contexts, the Christian traditions concerning the priesthood and women that come to us from the formative New Testament and patristic periods. The basic questions were: "Has this mass of material been responsibly used in the argument concerning women priests today? What is the actual content of this mass of tradition, has our statement of the content of tradition been true to historical fact? and, How might the tradition be used responsibly if it has not been?" The general conclusions seem to be clear.

First, the tradition is not nearly so clear and uniform as could be wished. This applies especially to the reasons adduced for denying the priesthood to women. They are many and various. They are contradicted in principle by other statements about woman's equality and spiritual capacity. It is clear that we cannot hold the reasons held by the fathers for the denial of priesthood to women and at the same time affirm as part of the tradition other statements by the fathers about woman's equality and spiritual capacity. It is clear that we cannot hold the reasons for this denial that there were held by any of the patristic writers and at the same time claim to be content with the developments in the position of women in the church and society since the eighteen forties. The fathers were by and large, subordinationists, not only in

the matter of liturgical priesthood, but outside the church also. Their denial of priesthood to women was based on this general subordinationism. They were literalists in interpretation, like Tertullian, or they were allegorists like Origen, to whom woman was per se a symbol of inferiority. The social history of our era will not allow us to be universal subordinationists, the growth of historical science will not allow us biblical literalism or an unrestrained allegorical exegesis. The reasons for the fathers' denial of priesthood to woman have all fallen.

Those presently opposed to the ordination of women have never dealt with the question of why this particular part of the writing of the fathers is authoritative and other parts are not. To appeal to tradition demands either consistency in that appeal, that we accept the fathers on their own terms and completely; or it requires a rational criterion of selection for what is retained and what is dismissed. In this debate so far, we have had neither.

The ambiguity of the tradition is clear when we realize that leading women were assumed to be masculine, that many fathers claimed women to be inherently the same as men before God, and yet denied them the same roles in the church, that Hellenistic social customs and philosophy were extremely influential in determining the place of women in the early Christian communities. Let me emphasize this last point.

The question of women priests was never discussed in relation to the theological content of fundamental doctrines like incarnation, resurrection, grace, sin, and the church as the community of salvation. It would be most intellectually dishonest of us to recognize the need for this sort of reflection and continue to appeal as authoritative to traditions that did not recognize it and did not do it. I have demonstrated

in my text the influence of culturally determined customs and thought forms in creating the tradition we inherit. We need to be careful that we do not accept statements of exclusion from priestly office and then reject the world view on which these statements are based. To use tradition in this way makes it merely an excuse for arbitrary action. For instance, if we are not neo-platonists, it is the clearest kind of arbitrariness to accept as authoritative those standards for church policy based directly on neo-platonic thought, because we would deny the assumptions and modes of reasoning from which those conclusions spring. Yet we use neo-platonic conclusions each time we appeal to the tradition of the fathers against the ordination of women.

I have shown how certain parts of the tradition, notably Galatians 3:28, the Genesis creation stories, Clement of Alexandria, and the two Gregories, cut against this Greek cultural inheritance. Other examples have been given of people like Chrysostom, who were caught between the cultural expectations and the dynamic of the Christian message. For myself, the equality and mutuality held up as a norm in the two biblical passages provide a much more significant hope for both Christian theologizing and the life of the Christian community than the subordinationism of the fathers or of Timothy. The former examples, Galatians, Genesis, Clement and the Gregories, open the way to seek and be sought by that infinite God who wants to make us all like himself. They emphasize our freedom and our hope in Christ. The latter examples, Timothy and those fathers relying on Hellenistic cultural norms, emphasize our condition as chained to the structures and limitations of this world. The choice seems clear for a Christian who joyfully accepts the freedom and responsibility of being in the world but not bound by the world.

APPENDIX

2

APPENDIX

The Appendix consists of the following three translations from the French:

- A. Allo, E.-B. Saint Paul, Première Èpître aux Corinthiens,
Excursus IX - The "Authority" on the head (XI.10).III
- B. Allo, E.-B. Saint Paul, Première Èpître aux Corinthiens,
Commentary on 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36. XIII
- C. Spicq, P.C. Saint Paul: Les Èpîtres Pastorales,
Commentary on 1 Tim. 2:11-15. XVIII

Appendix A

E.-B. Allo, Saint Paul, Premiere Epitre aux Corinthiens

"Excursus IX - The "Authority" on the head (XI.10).

This section of our epistle presents such difficulties in its details that Leitzmann did not hesitate to call it incomprehensible for us. Certainly, two points are very clear: first the existence of a general tradition of discipline, to which the Corinthians became subject; and next the harmony which the Apostle proclaims between the laws established by nature and those which had become governing for the membership of the church. It is a very profound truth that the latter, the baptised man, whoever he may be, the highest in authority, the most independent, the most holy, is with Christ in a relation that shows his subordination and his grandeur to the faith, a relation that is analogous to that between woman and man, in which she is to the faith the auxiliary and the "glory." Christ is man's head, says St. Thomas, because from him is derived in man all perfection, sublimity, vital influence, and conformation to other members of the church.

In order to understand the details of this passage, most exegetes, in order not to give in to the impression of discouragement given by some, have searched the documents which inform us concerning the Jewish and pagan usages of the time. For the Jews we have reproduced the conclusions of Strack and Billerbeck (as above). Among the Greeks, we know how they ordered things by a number of witnesses

among which it is usual to cite, for the time we are concerned with, Plutarch's Roman Questions 14: "It is most conformable to custom for women to go out in public veiled, for the men with head uncovered.", or Macrobius, Saturnalia I,8,2; III,6,17 for a later time. The monuments confirm the texts. Von Dobschutz (Urchristl. Gem. p. 33f) observes, following Rhode, that the usages vary from one city to another, and that in a city like Corinth the conventions may be less rigidly observed than in a town like Athens. Already the great Hellenistic ladies and the women of inferior classes did not bother with the veil, and it is possible that Paul has seen in the absence of the veil in public an excess of worldliness. Christian matrons and virgins ought not to take the emancipated appearance of a worldling or a courtesan.

Therefore he prescribes for all of them the wearing of the veil in meetings for prayer, for reasons which he fundamentally derives from religion. But why does he call this veil an *ἐξουσία* ? Gehard Kittel (Rabbinica, Paulus im Talmud. I,3, pp. 17-30) has formulated an explanation which one would wish to agree with, because it does away with all difficulties. *ἐξουσία* would have the direct meaning of covering, of enveloping, or veiling. Here is how he wishes to prove that.

The Jerusalem Talmud, Shabbath VI (8b) concerning Isaiah 3:18ff., when the toilet of the women of Jerusalem is described it includes toilet objects named *שִׁבְיָהּ* , and explains the words in this manner: *סוכה של שִׁבְיָהּ, דאז נחלך (מחלך) שלם* "sebism (He means to say) saltonayia; as if he were saying: *שִׁבְיָהּ* the sabis of the net of the head." (*הַשִּׁבְיָהּ* equals head.)

Saltonayia, an Aramean word which would seem at first to mean "authority", "Lordship"; deriving from a Semetic root like 𐤓𐤕𐤔 but which refers to an article of the toilette, would be an Aramaic equivalent to the ἐξουσία of Paul. The Talmud gives it as an explanatory word, and therefore one in current usage. It may be no longer necessary to seek for a symbolic sense for the ἐξουσία of Paul. It is true that Aquila has rendered the same word of Isaiah by τελευτωνας "bonds", "bands", from which Kraus has supposed that the original was not saltonayia but 𐤓𐤕𐤔 𐤕𐤕𐤕 ; only the Talmud which Aquila knew well, is not referred to for this word. Another word of the same root, 𐤓𐤕𐤔 of Jeremiah 51:11 and Ezechiel 27:11 is ordinarily rendered "shield"; but this translation is erroneous, because in II Chronicles 23:9 shields are named right besides the object designated by that word. Besides, there exist several Aramaic and Arabic words of the same root, which justify the supposition that the root šlt has another meaning beyond that of authority, a meaning which ought to fit equally objects like "sack" and "quiver"; this could only be "enclosed", "surrounded" or something approaching that. There were therefore, possible confusions between the diverse meanings of the root šlt , and a possible confusion and passage from one to the other. With Paul and the Jewish Christians at Corinth who would comprehend it, ἐξουσία would be able to be the literal translation of "saltonayia"; the Greek word corresponding to one of the meanings of the Semetic will serve equally in order to render the other meaning (cf. a closely similar though previous theory in Herklotz, Bib. Zeitschrift, 1912, p. 154, "Zu I Kor. 11:10").

All this is rather fascinating, although complicated, but as Strack-Billerbeck writes, would the Greeks have been able to comprehend such a Semiticism? Also, qualified Semitists have made fun of this opinion as they have of the "Metonymy." Do we admit that the "metonymy," which nevertheless has to be intelligible to the Greeks, has been made easier in the spirit of Paul by recalling to his memory of that word *saltonayia*? Did Paul think in Aramaic in such a manner that the parallel associations were instinctive to him? We doubt it highly.

In the end it does not seem to us that one is able to make a satisfactory foundation for the thesis of Kittel or of Herklotz and we are thrown back on more ancient interpretations. They are of two sorts:

- a. *ἐξουσία* would mean "power", the instrument of defensive power against invisible attacks.
- b. It may be a simple trope, a metonymy, in order to signify "the sign of the power" exercised over the women or by the women.

a. The first exegesis finds its ancestry in Tertullian (De virginibus velandis 7): "propter angelos," *silicet quos legimus a deo et coelo excidisse ob concupiscentiam feminarum.*" Cf. Contra Marcionem V.8. All modern syncretists who discover in the veil an instrument of apotrophic magic, a defensive power, depend in their interpretation on that "concupiscence of the angels" against which the woman would defend herself in covering her head. And we must consider the reason.

First, these angels are certainly angelic spirits, and not the faithful as Clement of Alexandria has believed, or the ministers of the cult that Ambrosiaster saw there. But must it be concluded from the fact that ἐξουσία active, means an "authority" belonging to the woman herself that this power is used against the angels because they are hostile to her or will be tempted by her charms? Everling first, later Schmiedel, Bebilus, Leitzmann, J. Weiss et al. accept the opinion of Tertullian, then explain that the veil was a defense of the woman against the desires of the angels, the sensuality of spirits in general, the attacks of the invisible world. Reitzenstein (Poimandres p. 230, n.I) says that the passage seems to indicate (because he has doubts) that Paul judged women, especially in ecstasy, to be partially exposed to the attack of πνεύματα. In the same work and his Hell. Mysterienrel. he strives to show that ἐξουσία was, among the Hermetics and Gnostics, the essentially magical meaning of "power" based on Gnosis, and that this sense would be passed on to Paul. These thinkers believe they have discovered a number of supports in the literature. One recalls the fact that in Enoch and other apocalyptic works, like the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs, Reuben 5, that Joseph and some Rabbis, have taken the "sons of God" of Genesis 6:22ff as the angels, who, with women have engendered giants; or again the jealousy of evil spirits, as of Asmodeus in Tobit (Tobit 3:8), in regard to young married couples, and of numerous other examples given of the relation between the Devil and Eve, of Asmodeus with the wives of Solomon, just as Rashi says in a passage of Berakhoth 54b, according

to which a sick person, a woman in child birth, an engaged couple, have need of special protection against demons (folk-lore generally agrees) and other texts also. See Strack-Billerbeck p. 437 and 439.3, a text of the old author Wagenseil (1681) summarized thus by Wellstein (Sota, p. 43): "Malus est angelus, qui vocatur Usiel, si videat mulierem nudato capite. R. Simeon filius Jocahi: Si mulieris capillus nudus est, venient mali spiritus, eique insident, et omnia, quae in domo sunt, perdunt." One knows that the history of the angels of Enoch has been used by many ancient ecclesiastical writers: Justin (Apology I, 5 and 21) invoked by Schmiedel, attributes the elegant histories of the gods of paganism to evil spirits, *δαίμονες φερόμενοι*, who in ancient times had committed adultery with the wives of men. One is able to cite quite a few other instances also.

Certainly the exegetes who have a less syncretistic spirit, Strack-Billerbeck among them, make the objection to begin with that Paul, to judge by all the rest of his terminology, speaks here only of good angels; it would be strange, it is indeed impossible, that he imagines their nature as accessible to such temptations (see Bachmann, Sickengerger, Kittel, etc.). This last author observes justly that this interpretation of *διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους* introduces an idea completely foreign to the argument of Paul, because vs. 10 is only the conclusion of vs. 7ff; Robertson-Plummer, severely but justly, go so far as to declare the reference to Genesis 6 to be childish---and the angels of Enoch to be irrelevant to our passage. But before these objections of principle and literary criticism it is other

objections that will be decisive and they alone: it is first that, in each of the texts used for the Jewish or Christians, sensuality is not attributed to good angels, of which Paul certainly speaks, but only to fallen spirits. See Strack-Billerbeck, the passages of Peshitta rabba 43 (179b), Chagiga 16^a or Gen. Rabba 8, which he gives in his examples.

The good spirits, in rabbinic thought, play the role of beneficent guardian angels. But their mission is able to become dangerous for man, because as (says for example) the Babylonian Talmud Taanit^a II (cited by Kittel, p. 27): the two angels of service who accompany each man, render witness, as it is written in Psalm 91, of his good or evil actions. But the texts relating to the hair of women, which exposes them to the attacks of evil angels, as those of Wagenseil (supra) cited literally by Kittel, p. 279 and Strack-Billerbeck p. 439ff. never appear in the time of the Talmud or a previous epoch, but are attributed expressly to **הַנְּסִי הַקִּיּוּלָה** to the "sages of the Kabbala," that is to say they are only the speculations of medieval Judaism; and it would be very reckless in the opinion of these Semeticists to carry them back to the age of Paul, secondly, if the Talmud refuses to provide any support for the opinion cited one will search in vain, in the history of pagan superstitions of the first centuries, for the property of the veil as a magic defence against evil spirits. Leitzmann acknowledges that it is never attested outside Paul. Also he is not very sure of his own interpretation---not more than are those intelligent syncretists, Reitzenstein and

J. Weiss. The latter says (p. 275) "Thus we endeavor to explain this difficult passage, hoping for the coming of an exterior light." It has not come. And it will not come, for all the reasons exposed above their opinion is not sustainable.

b. It remains necessary therefore to explain *ἐξουσία* as a figure, a metonymy: "(something that has relation to) authority." That so abstract a word comes to designate an accessory of clothing is a very hard transposition, and one of which one does not have other examples for the same word; because in those which are given by Bachmann, Luke 4:6 (*ἐξουσία* for domain, field) or Romans 13:1 (*ἐξουσία* for constituted authority) it has there only the specifications of its literal meaning; the same for *τιμῇ* of 1 Cor. 12:23. This latter case is an incorrect comparison since there the word signifies properly "consideration" for the members of the human body, although that consideration may have as an effect that one covers them with a vestment. But there are other abstract words undersoing, in Biblical or profane languages, transformations still more difficult and which are not doubted although rather poorly attested. In this manner Diodore of Sicile (I, XLVII, 5 cited by Toussaint) writes that a statue of an old Egyptian Queen carries "three royalties on her head" *τρεῖς βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς*, that is to say, three crowns, sign of a triple royalty. Kittel recalls v. 37 of Numbers 6, in the Septuagint, where it is said, concerning the hair of a Nazirite, that he ought not to shave for ordinary mourning, *ὅτι ἐν λῆθι θεοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ* "because the prayer---or the consecration

of God, is on his head." Whether we like it or not, we have to admit some similar metonymy for our *ἐξουσία* on the head of the woman; it is the veil, sign of authority.

For all this, what is the power? The most simple evidently, would be to think with the majority of exegetes, of the authority of man to which the woman is subjected, and of translating it as "sign of subjection." Chrysostom and Theodore-, who know their Greek, have understood it so. It may be, however, that the rarity of the expression has reduced them to suppositions, and that they have not seen all the meaning. In actual fact, one has to point out, with justice, that *ἐξουσία* never appears elsewhere in the passive sense. On the other hand, let us remember that, in all this section, Paul is concerned not only in proclaiming the subordination of woman, but with lifting high her honor. Also, if we are to take sides, it is better, we believe, to side with Ramsey in The Cities of Saint Paul, p. 220ff, (which is cited with agreement by Robertson-Plummer, p. 232) because: "In the oriental countries the veil is the authority, honor and dignity of the woman. With the veil on her head, she is able to go everywhere in security encompassed by a deep respect.... But without the veil the woman is a thing of nothing that anyone at all is able to insult."

This refers, it is true, to modern customs, but the principle is ancient. (The laws of the Assyrians already impose the veil on married women.) It is a sign of their dignity, of their belonging to a single man and of their independence in regard to all others, that

the Greek matrons were veiled. In Judaism, the Kalakla says that the uncovered head of the fiance on the day of her wedding is the sign of her virginity, that is to say, of an inferior state in the ideas of the rabbis compared with the dignity of a married woman.

Thus woman, according to St. Paul, should wear a veil in public, not only as a sign of subjection, but in order to express that she participates in the authority of man, of whom she is the glory as he is of God. To neglect wearing the veil might not shock the Corinthians but would shock the guardians of the natural order, of human dignity and of the holiness of the place of the cult, and the angels who are there and would accuse her of disorder before God. Other times, other morals, but the superior principles of which Paul here makes an application valid for Corinth, are valid for all countries and all times.

Appendix B

E.-B. Allo. Saint Paul, Première Épître aux Corinthiens.

Commentary on 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36.
(p. 371)

33b. Here we see the other grant principle which has inspired Paul in the treatment of all these mystic phenomena, besides that of the solidarity of the 'members of Christ'. The God of the Christians, who is a God of peace (cf. Romans 15:33, 16:20) is not able to will and inspire disorder, as are the pagan gods, created by the human imagination or the suggestions of the devil. This is reported again in 12:3. It is necessary for a teacher such as Paul to prevent these imaginative and excitable converts from pressing the new wine into their old skins and from practically returning again into the superstitious mysticism of their past. They have, at least among themselves, concealed the new doctrine of a fall in Greco-Roman Gnosis, in a sort of rationalist philosophy, as we know thanks to Paul's instructions in the beginning of the letter.

34. We fasten to this verse, as they ought to be, the last words of the preceding: ὡς ἐν π. τ. ἐκλ. τῷ ὅλῳ. All the world agrees on that point. That appeal to the uniformity of the teachings of the discipline in the church we have already found (4:7, 7:17) and many times since chapter 11 and it is present also in other letters,

and is indeed the beginning of Catholicism (in spite of J. Weiss). But there is notable variation in the wordings of the most ancient witnesses. G. Chup and the Vulgate have added to the end $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\omega$ or "doceo," which is perhaps an assimilation to 4:17. Marcion has a more curious reading in the preceding verse; he suppresses $\delta\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ (without doubt because of horror at the God of the Old Testament) and writes "the spirits of the prophets shall be subject to the prophets;" because they are not the spirits of disorder (aversions, according to Tertullina, who is able to translate it literally in his citation, Adv. Marcion 6:4) but of peace." (Harnack, Marcion, 1921, p. 88) The Ambr^r has been influenced by the Marcionite reading when it writes: "Spirit is not the author of dissension, but of peace, even as in all the churches of the Holy I teach." (The word "author" supposes that he has read $\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in place of $\delta\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, Leitzman). $\psi\mu\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ is added after $\gamma\upsilon\gamma\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ by D,E,F,G,K,L,al. Ambr^r adds $\psi\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ for $\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ in the same codd. syr^a has added $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\delta\epsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$.

Verses 34 and 35 have been placed after verse 40, at the end of the chapter by D,E,F,G,93, Ambr^r. All these variants and displacements have furnished some with a reason to deny the authenticity of this pericope (see the introduction to it). But it is possible that the confusion brought to the Marcionite text of 33 and the rectification that necessarily follows in its train with respect to Marcion is a sufficient reason. [Freely Tr.] Halsten and Schmiedel have rejected at one and the same time this passage and 11:4-5 (equally

concerning women) because they appear to them in contradiction with vs. 34 and 35. Because we know that there were recognized Christian prophetesses, Gutjahr and others after St. Thomas have carefully noticed that women are excluded only from the public exercise of prophecy. According to this passage, she is not to share her gift in public. With respect to glossalalia, one understands that St. Paul has found the impressionability of women still more than that of men. Paul does not wish to deal with it in his church.

In chapter 11, v.5, the Apostle seems, however, to suppose that women prophecy in public; and he does not forbid it to them, he says only that it is indecent to do so in the assemblies when they do not wear a veil. That is not a contradiction as Sickenberger wishes to make it, but an example of his technic in controversy. Faced with a complex abuse which he wishes to destroy, he begins by only examining it under one aspect, which is able to be perceived as secondary, before attacking the principle, that which is in fact substantive. We have seen it again in chapters 8 and 10, concerning meals in pagan temples; he first only blames them for a general reason, lack of charity, then for the proper reason that they make a "communicatio in sacris." The same here. Or as Labriolle thinks, ("Montanism," p. 176) Paul envisages exceptional cases in chapter 11; because all law has its exception.

That prohibition is not derived by interpolation from 1 Tim 2:11ff. which repeats it. The practice of Paul on this point has to

be invariable, because it was dictated to him by experience and by the exigencies of Greek mores (which judged it indecent, *ἀισχρόν* for a woman to discourse in public), even more than by that pretended remnant of anti-feminism derived from his semitic background (Bousset et al.), which one often hears him reproached with. Much has been written on the feminism or anti-feminism of Paul. The last work known to us on the subject, G. Dellling, Paulus Stellung zu Frau und Ehe (Stuttgart, 1931) still supposes for the Apostle much of this Jewish prejudice, when it imputes to him the idea that the woman is a second class human being. At least in 1 Cor. 11:7 and 4 and in the celebrated passage of Ephesians one may see the high ideal that Paul holds for the role of women in the family and the Christian society.

Reply

I cannot resist the temptation to comment on the argument in this work. If Paul permitted women to prophecy in public with veils at one point in his letter and then denied them all speech whatsoever, it is no wonder that the poor Corinthians did not know what he was talking about. If Paul actually did use such a technique in argument, then he was a liar, or at the very best an equivocator who would say things he did not mean. We have no concrete evidence that, in fact, Paul's practice on the point of women's silence in the church was invariable because we do not know what his experience was and I do not see that Allo can claim to. In the body of my thesis

one may see the complications of Greek customs that make a claim that women's voices were shameful under all circumstances too broad a claim. Besides, this was at least as prominent a part of Judaism as of Greek mores, if not more so. This commentary has been very influential, but I find the argument totally unsatisfactory.

Appendix C

P.C. Spicq. Saint Paul: Les Epitres Pastorales. p. 70f.

11. The Christian assemblies were consecrated not only to the celebration of the meal and to prayer, but also to the teaching and manifestation of diverse charisms. St. Paul forbids women to speak out and take "the word" for themselves. It is the same proscription as in 1 Cor. 14:34-35 and aims to guarantee order and dignity in church services. The promptness of women to speak is known: "That sex is talkative" says St. John Chrysostom, who complains of gossip that his contemporaries maintain in the church; "The words of women are inflammatory." (Thomas) Therefore men will recite psalms, speak in tongues, prophecy or announce revelations and women will be instructed keeping silence or remaining calm, tranquil, and that not only exteriorly, but in respectful submission to that which is said and to their husbands; this last nuance is suggested by 'ὑποταγή' (cf. Eph. V. 24; *ἡσυχία* : to remain peaceful, tranquil, Lyke XIV.4; Acts XI.18, XXI.14). By their silence the women know themselves to be in a dependent situation; it is the very spirit of moderation, opposing itself to the ostentation of vs. 9, 10, and is as Aristotelean in inspiration as Jewish. The Stagirite studies the interior order which ought to exist in the man, and declares that the chief strength of man is that of commanding,

ἀρχική , and the strength of the woman that of obeying (execution?)
 ὑπερετική ; he cites with approval the verse of Sophocles,
 Ajax 293: *χουλιξὶ κόσμον ἢ σιγὴ φέρει* and concludes
 silence to be the ornament of women (1 Politics XIII, 1260a, 30).
 That will be her first good work!

12-14 The opposite of this submission would be to teach---
 in public, as the context specifies, this is an act of authority
vis-a-vis the hearers. *Αὐθεντέω* , hap. b. is the first
 known use of this word in Greek Literature; cf. a first century
 B.C. papyrus in Berlin: *καμὰν αὐθεντηκότος πρὸς αὐτοῦ*
 (Aegyptische Urkunden aus der Museen zu Berlin 1208, 37); here the
 parallelism rigorously opposes it to ὑποταγή and associates it
 to *διδάσκειν* (cf. 1 Cor. XIV. 35, *μὴν θάνω*).
 The substantive, *αὐθέντης* (Wisdom XII,6) designates that which
 acts of itself, from which comes absolute mastery; it is applied first
 to the instigator of a crime, especially a murder, in order to dis-
 tinguish him from his accomplice; here it is applied to anyone who
 takes the initiative, assuming on his own head, a responsibility; this
 nuance fits our passage and confirms the repetition of the order: women
 ought to remain *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ* , one translates that: in repose
 (peace of mind) (cf. *ἡσυχάζω*, LK. 23:56; *ἡσυχίος* ,
 1 Tim 2:2). This prohibition of playing the teacher will be revived
 by the 4th Council of Carthage in 398; it is justified by the text of
 Genesis II,22: Woman is out of man; this chronological succession and

and physical dependence establishes for St. Paul in the name of God and of nature the immutable superiority of one sex over the other (cf. 1 Cor. XI, 8). St. John Chrysostom and St. Thomas interpret it in terms of finality: the woman has been created for the man and in his image, and not the man for the woman; according to the rabbis, he who is created first is better than the second (Strack-Billerbeck). Even more, the woman allowed herself to be seduced by the serpent (cf. 2 Cor. XI.3) and has been the agent of Adam's transgression. She had not only fallen first, but she had swept up her husband and all men into her fall (Eccli. XXV.24; "facilius decepta facilius decipit," Bengel, cited by Bernard). St. Paul does not draw back from the practical application of that culpable beginning, but is able to think of the sanction of Gen. III.16 where the punishment imposed on Eve and her descendents is to suffer the domination of man; the perfect tense, *γεγόνεν (ἐν παραδείσῳ)* suggests, in effect, that the consequences of the initial act remain (cf. the analogous constructions: *γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ*, 2 Tim. 1:17; *γενόμενος ἐν Σαλαμῖνι*, Acts 13:5; *γενέσθαι ἐν ἑκστάσει*, Acts 22:7; *ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι*, Apoc. 4:2; 1:10).

The feminine condition will always be that of a punished sinner and, under the circumstances, the one to be taught, *μανθανέτω*, (cf. the comic poet Philemon: woman is a necessary evil. "*ἄρα τὸν ἔστι κακὸν ἀναγκαῖον*" , after Strobe IV,

22, 30; cf. 77). More exactly, Eve has fallen into sin in consequence of a lie which she has believed; while Adam's fault resulted from his extremely great affection for his wife. The emphasis is strongly placed on the verb ἁπατάω (cf. Gen. 3:14) and its compose, ἐξαπατάω, which accentuates the idea of ἁπατάω (cf. 2 Co¹ ἐξαπατάω is well attested with the exception of L and some miniscules which repeat ἁπατάω, as they show the construction Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη and the adversative δέ; ἡ δέ συνὴ ἐξαπατηθεῖσα. St. Augustine already was remarking (City of God 14:11); it is not said that Adam did not sin, but that he was not deceived; on the contrary, the defect of Eve is of being easily seduced by the worst of illusions; it is because she was more credulous that the serpent made her his accomplice."

A. Catharin observes that in the state of innocence, ignorance, and error, far from diminishing the sin, aggravate it. The aorist emphasizes that this possibility for seduction remains; it is as the attribute of feminine nature. Also St. Paul writes ἡ συνὴ and not ἔνθα; a woman will always be more easily deceived than a man--- and see here, surely, why the apostolate is forbidden to women (οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, cf. 1 Cor. 14:34). Not only are they forbidden to have authority over their husbands but also especially from teaching the truth in the church, especially in Ephesus where the faith is menaced. "She has taught man once, and all was lost. That is why God has subjugated her, because she had made evil use of her

authority or better, of her equality" (Chrysostom); "She ought to be in humility since through her death entered into the world" (Ambrosiaster). It is necessary to remember that for Judaism and especially for St. Paul, Adam and Eve are the representatives of all the human race, and that their case has a typological value for their respective descendents (Romans V.12sv.). St. Thomas justifies the apostolic precept by appealing to the intellectual inferiority of women compared with men: "Eorum qui deficiunt ratione proprium est addiscere." But in back of this lies St. Paul's energetic proclamation of the absolute spiritual equality of both sexes before God and his demand from women as well as men prayer for the salvation of the world. If the arguments of the Apostle baffle the contemporary mentality it occurs to us that it is necessary to assign to each a place and a precise role in an official organization and that the very nature of woman destines her to the domestic hearth (v. 15). The commentators since Pelatius and Theodore of Mopsuestia have finally remarked that the woman has the right and the duty, in the house, to instruct her children, even her husband, and that since Priscilla, who instructed Appollos (2 Tim. 1:5, 3:15, cf. Titus 2:3,4); St. Monica, Patricius; St. Clotilde, Clovis; until St. Catherine of Sienna, a number of Christian women have enjoyed a teaching role of the first importance in the church, but never in the sanctuary. Finally the Apostolic prohibition certainly opposes the feminine pretensions which were affirmed with more and more success in the

Hellenistic epoque. Not only in the Greek city states of Asia and even in Greece were the women more free and more considered than at other times, but it is not rare that she had access to magistrates. One sees girls and women entering into the college of races in Ephesus, to receive the title of Prytanes. Others developed their education at the same time that their moral condition improved; certain of them had a knowledge of Greek and Latin literature, cultivated philosophy or are famed for their finesse of Spirit (cf. Juvenal, Sat. 5:43sv., A.J. Festugiere, P. Fabre, Le Monde greco-romain au temps de N.S., 1, p. 133sv.). The role which women will be able to play in the church with the titles of widow and deaconess will only be possible in the strength of that emancipation, which Judaism had always ignored. It remains that the exclusion of women from teaching and cultural functions was a novelty in the ancient world, where priestesses officiate at a number of cults of the Empire (cf. J. Toutain, Les Cultes paiens dans l'empire romain, Paris, 1907, 1, pp. 141f); and Gnosticism will restore to women a place of honor in the spreading of the sect, even conferring on her sometimes a dignity that is properly ecclesiastical (cf. P. Labriolle, "Mulieres in Ecclesia taceant," in Bulletin d'ancienne litterature et d'archeologie chretienne, 1911, pp. 15-24, 103-122, 292, 298).

15 There was therefore a permanent punishment on women by God. St. Paul corrects this text, lest its punishment be too harsh--- adding that women will obtain salvation not by teaching (cf. Dan. 12:13) but through child-bearing, in accomplishing the duties proper

to her sex. *Gratia non tollit naturam!* According to Xenophon (Constitution of Sparta 1:4) Lycurgus considered that the first and most noble function of free women was to bring children into the world. It is not necessary for Eve (von Soden) as the connection with vs. 14 indicates, since the words are in the future, neither even for all the daughters of Eve, of women in general, since faith and charity are required, but of Christians (Pelagius). They will be benefited by the salvation willed by God for all (vs. 14) and realized by Christ (1:15). This understanding is obvious, but the commentators are divided on the exact interpretation to give to that salvation obtained by Child-bearing. 1. One is able to think that St. Paul, keeping within the spirit of the history of the fall, is thinking of the punishment of women, that is, child-bearing in sorrow (Gen. 3:16); so that the reason for this suffering is the expiation of sin; 2. But generation is a natural act, which, of itself, is in no way meriting of eternal life. Motherhood, which is in all ways the duty of married women, will only be holy if it is assumed in a fitting spirit and is achieved along with the Christian education of children. The sign of this achievement will be the perseverance of the children in faith and love, the essential Christian virtues (cf. 1:15). If women do not have public activity in the church, they receive its blessing on the domestic hearth, the churches qualities are efficacious there, they shine there and she consummates also its salvation (Titus 2:4). Such is the traditional meaning accepted by St. John Chrysostom (who has a beautiful homily on the Christian

education of children), St. John of Damascus, Herve of Gourg-Dieu (who insists on the efficacy of that work of mercy), Hugh of St. Cher, Nicolas of Lyra, Estius, Padovani, Belser, Bardy. The idea is Aristotelian. The Stagirite requires that women have many children in order that they may be good and beautiful; quality ought to be united to quantity, *εὐτεκνία καὶ πολυτεκνία* (Politics 4:14; 1335b; Rhetoric Si 1360b; 1361a). But it is none the less strange that the salvation of women depends on the Christian life of their children; and according to others *τεκνογονία* is in the singular; one must supply the plural subject *οἱ παῖδες* before *μεένωσιν*. Ambrosiaster glosses: "Cum his (pueris) liberabitur mulier resurgens a mortuis, non quod ab illis liberabitur," and the Vulgate suppresses the difficulty by transforming the verb to a singular "si permanebit." 3. One might suppose with Rabanus Maurus, Cajetan, Lock, that it is necessary for both the husband and wife (cf. V. 12-14), he and she are saved by persevering; this subtle enough suggestion corresponds certainly to a very Pauline thought, sanctification was afterwards associated with the idea of sexual purity (cf. 1 Thess. 4:3 and 7; Romans 6:22; 1 Cor. 7:34; 2 Cor. 7:1). Ellicott, van Soden, Wahlenberg, take an interpretation of Theophylacte pointed out by Cornelius a Lapide, and see here an illusion to childbearing saving through the excellence of the Virgin Mary, she abolishes [by bearing the Christ] the luckless work of Eve; consider here the article before *τεκνογονία*. It is in reality a thought that one finds frequently expressed in the 2nd

Century (cf. St. Ignatius, Eph. 19; St. Justin, C. Trysh. 100; Tertullian, De Carne XLI:17; St. Irenaeus, Her. 5:19, 3:22). But it is without a parallel in the New Testament and it appears well isolated in the context. 5. St. Augustine (Enarr. sur les Ps. LXXXIII, 4,7) comments mystically: the generation of children is a symbol for good works. He follows Origen who decomposes ΤΕΚΝΟΓΟΝΙΑ into $\gammaυνή$ which equals $\psiυχή$ and ΤΕΚΝΑ which equals $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha$. He has made a partial link with A. Catherin and the moderns (Bernard, Stelhorn, Parry, Knabenbauer, B. Weiss, Falconer), the plural of $\muεινωσιν$ is used of women of vs. 9, 10; or more simply, note that in all this section $\gammaυνή$ is collective and is able regularly to be the subject of a plural verb (syllepse). Others observe that $\delta\iota\alpha$ with the genitive often marks the being or condition in which a person or action is placed (cf. Abel 49, a,b) in the sense of "to the middle, with, across" (cf. 1 Cor. 3:15: $\sigma\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota, \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma \omicron\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma \delta\iota\alpha\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$; 2 Cor. 2:4: $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\rho\alpha\psi\alpha\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\zeta\ \delta\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon\omega\zeta$; 3:11; 4:8; Romans 2:27; 14:20).

Therefore, it is not that the woman is saved in spite of motherhood, neither by the merit of motherhood, but while being a mother, that is to say, while she is acquainting herself with her duties as a married woman playing the role proper to her feminine nature; motherhood is the good work which devolves to women (cf. vs. 10; $\delta\iota\alpha = \epsilon\nu$ cf. Romans 4:11). W.M. Ramsey (The Teaching of St. Paul in Terms of the Present Day, London, 1914, pp. 170f) cites Sophecles, "Electra" 770: $\delta\epsilon\lambda\nu\delta\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\delta\ \tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu\ \kappa\tau\lambda$; he has grasped well that

ΤΕΚΝΟΓΟΪΑ designates less the sources of child-birth than the maternal instinct, the love and the self-sacrifice that the mother lavishes on her children. The meaning of this passage is then clear. Women obtain salvation while passing through maternity, but formally by perseverance in a fervant Christian life. The words *δία τῆς τεκνογούας* to which exaggerated importance is attributed, are only a parenthesis, a transcription of Genesis 3:16 (*ἐν ὑπάλι τέξῃ τέκνα*), and very likely an allusion to heretical teachings *κωλυόντων γαμεῖν* (Irenaeus 1, 24, 2, cites the Gnostics: nubere autem et generare a Satana dicunt esse). We know of the constant care of Paul to sanction that human condition willed by God. If he mentions motherhood, it is that it is the normal vocation of woman, to the inverse of a teaching position which is the work proper to men; and it is exactly in seeing there, in this sense, with St. Augustine, the symbol of good works, which one today would call the duty of that station. If the Apostle suddenly employs a verb in the plural (*μεινύσων*, v. 15b) it is because he sees all women Christians, married or not, as confirming the formula: "Sanctification with modesty," which is the specific feminine ideal of vs. 9-10 and is then not applied to children. On the other hand widows without children are equally assured of salvation (cf. V. 5f). In order to justify the irregularity of this construction one might accept the following hypothese: having mentioned salvation by bearing children St. Paul remembers that Artemis the goddess of Ephesus, is the

protectoress of women in childbirth. (Plutarch, Quest. Conv. III, 10,10; Euripides, "Suppl." 958; "Hipp." 166; Plato, Thaetetus 149b; C.I.G. 1595,1768,3562,7032; Callimarchus, Hymn III, 20-25, 126-30). She is the one who "rescues" them in that trial. He then corrects the possible equivocation on that σωτηρία in precisely that the salvation of the Christian soul is obtained by faith and charity. More probably, the Apostle seeks to give a general conclusion to all this section, and as is his wont, he formulates it in some words that are both condensed and brief. As a substantial consolation for his prohibition, a bit annoying to the Ephesian women because of their susceptibility to speaking the word in church, he guarantees eternal salvation to women. This depends solely upon fellowship with God by faith and brotherly love, but not on the exercise of a charism (1 Cor. XIII.1-3). By the work of these theological virtues, the soul is holy, united to God, but according to the exhortation of the Apoc. 22:11: "ὁ ἅγιος ἀγλασθήτω ἑτέλ" " for Christian women ought to attempt more sanctification (ἀγλασμός, nomen actionis) in marriage itself, ἐν ἀγλασμῷ κατεμῆ, (1 Thess. 4:4). The body was intended for this consecration: εἰς ἀγλασμόν (Romans 4:19). This sanctification by works that infused justice sets itself to produce gives fruits for eternal life: ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἀγλασμόν, τὸ δευτελὸς ζωῆς αἰώνιοις

It is also the battle for moral life demanded by God from all men. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν θελημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀγλασμός ὑμῶν (1 Thess. 4:3; cf. Hebrews 12:14). But for women that holy life will

be conducted in a spirit of moderation, of dignity, and of discretion, sign of true virtue and conforming to their condition, *μετὰ σωφροσύνης* : with the genitive, *μετά* designates the circumstances which accompany the action (cf. 2 Cor. 7:15, 8:4) and with an abstract name it is equivalent to an adverb (Matt. 13:20, Mark 6:25, Luke 14:9). Aristotle made *σωφροσύνη* the first moral virtue of the feminine sex (Rhet. 1,5,1361a). Theophrastus points out that Greek women---without doubt coming out of girls schools---undergo the tests of moderation and domestic economy *περὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ οἰκονομίας* according to Athenees 13 (cf. Ziebarth, Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen, Leipzig, 1914, p. 144). An epitaph in Naples (Corp. Inscript. graec. 5819) celebrates a young woman to whom Aphrodite had given beauty and Athene *σωφροσύνη* .

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A.	Genesis.	.XXXIV
B.	The Position of Women in Paganism and Judaism. . . .	.XXXVI
C.	Jesus' Attitude Toward Women	.XXXVIII
D.	Paul	
	1. General discussion of Paul's position.	.XXXIX
	2. Articles on 1 Corinthians 11:2-16.	.XLI
	3. Articles on 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36.	.XLV
	4. Articles on 1 Timothy 2:11-15.	.XLVI
	5. Articles on Galatians 3:28	.XLVII
E.	Articles on the General Question of Women and Office in the Bible.	.XLVIII
F.	Patristic Writings	
	1. Primary sources.	.L
	2. Secondary sources.	.LIV
	3. Periodical literature.	.LVII
G.	Canon Law.	.LIX
H.	Medieval Materials	.LXI
I.	Twentieth Century Conflict Over the Priesthood of Women in England and America.	.LXIII
J.	The History of Deaconesses in the Anglican Communion.	.LXIX
K.	Official Publications and Reports	
	1. Anglican	.LXX
	2. Church of Scotland	.LXXI

3.	Lutheran Church.	LXXI
4.	Roman Catholic Church.	.LXXII
5.	Other Churches	.LXXII
L.	The Debate in the Church of Sweden and Among Mainline Protestant Churches	.LXXII
M.	The Debate in the Roman Catholic Church.	.LXXIV
N.	The Debate in the Orthodox Church.	.LXXVI
O.	Miscellaneous Articles	.LXXVI
P.	Ecumenical Concerns.	.LXXVIII

The following bibliography is in no sense complete, for the number of books and articles written about or relating directly to the ordination of women is tremendous. It includes materials valuable because of the new light they shed on the topic itself and because they illustrate for the historian a phase in the development of the question. The bibliography covers considerably more ground than the thesis, but I believe it should be helpful to others approaching the topic from any angle.

I have not read all the sources listed here, but have skimmed all the ones available on the Pacific Coast. Some entries are not complete; for these the missing information was not available. All annotated entries have been read carefully, unless otherwise noted. They are important works for understanding the topic.

The bibliography is organized by topic. This is somewhat arbitrary, since many articles cover more than one aspect of the question, but I have tried to place entries under the most appropriate heading.

A. Genesis

- Asselin, David T. "The Notion of Dominion in Genesis 1-3." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, X (1954), 277-294.
The dominion that humankind has is a share in God's dominion, and is given to both male and female equally.
- Baily, John A. "Initiation and the Primal Woman in Gilgamesh and Genesis 2-3." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIX (1970), 137-150.
- Barr, J. "The Image of God in the Book of Genesis--A Study of the Terminology (Gen. 1, 26-27, 9,6)." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, LI (1968), 11-26.
- Bic, M. "Theology of the Biblical Creation Epic," Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok, XXVIIIIs (1963s), 9-30.
- Bonnard, P.-E. "L'Origine de l'humanité selon la Bible," Le Ami du Clergé, LXXIX (1969), 713-719.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gen. 2,23a)," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXXII:4 (1970), 532-42.
Brueggemann interprets Gen. 2:23 in terms of covenant rather than biological derivation. The partnership of shared loyalty is the key to understanding the J creation epic.
- Cazelles, H. "La Nouvelle Eve. Gen. III,15. Exégèse contemporaine." Bulletin de la Société Française d'Études Mariales, II (1956), 91-96.
- Chazelle, A. "Mortalité ou immortalité corporelle du premier homme créé par Dieu." Nouvelle Revue Théologique, LXXXIX (1967), 1043-61s.
- Holloday, William L. "Jeremiah and Women's Liberation." Andover Newton Quarterly, (March 1972), 213-223.
- Hunt, Joseph I. "The Bible and the Status of Women--Equality, Subordination, Leadership." Unpublished paper presented to the conference of Anglican Theologians, Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, Ill. September 2-5, 1975, p. 1-21, notes v.
A very helpful paper covering in capsule form the main Old Testament texts set against the social conditions of the time in which they were written. Discusses bridal imagery for the people of God and leadership roles of women in the Old Testament.
- Kaufman, G. "Imago Dei as Man's Historicity." Journal of Religion, XXXVI (1956), 157-68.

- Kikawada, I. M. "Two Notes on Eve," Journal of Biblical Literature, XCI (1972), 33-37.
- Lambert, G. "Le drame du jardin d'Éden," Nouvelle Revue Théologique, LXXVI (1954), 1050.
- Lussief, Ernest. "Adam in Genesis," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVIII:2 (1956), 137-39.
Lussief's short article is a catalogue of the different uses of "Adam" in Genesis, trying to distinguish which are proper names and which are generic.
- Miller, J. Maxwell. "In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God," Journal of Biblical Literature, XCI:3 (1972), 289-304.
Traces the history of the interpretation of 'image' and 'likeness', and includes a form-critical analysis of Genesis 9:6, relating it to the original blessing of the world by God, Genesis 1:26-7.
- McKenzie, John L. "The Literary Characteristics of Gen. 2-3," Theological Studies, XV (1954), 541-572.
- Nielsen, Eduard. "Creation and the Fall of Man," Hebrew Union College Annual, XLIII (1972), 1-22.
- O'Rourke, J. J. "Eve's Formation from Adam in Modern Theology," Revue de Université Ottawa, XXXV (1956), 161-191.
- Ouellette, Lucien. "Woman's Doom in Genesis 3:16," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XII:4 (1950), 389-99.
A good example of pre-Vatican II Roman exegesis. The dogmatic position of the church influences the reading of the Biblical text.
- Rad, Gerhard von. Genesis, A Commentary, tr. John H. Marks. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.
- Reiser, Werner. "Die Verwandtschaftsformel in Gen. 2,23," Theologische Zeitung, XVI (1960), 1-4.
- Rigaux, B. "La femme et son lignage dans Genèse III,14-15," Revue Biblique, LXI (1954), 321-348.
- Simpson, Cuthbert A. "The Book of Genesis, Introduction and Exegesis," in George Arthur Buttrick and others (eds.) The Interpreter's Bible. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952. II: 439-829.
- Skinner, John. Genesis. International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: Clark, 1910.
Good on text critical studies, somewhat weaker on interpretation.
- Stern, H. S. "The Knowledge of Good and Evil," Vetus Testamentum, VIII (1958), 405-18.

Thompson, P. E. S. "The Yahwist Creation Story," Vetus Testamentum, XXI (1971), 197-208.

Trible, Phyllis. "Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation," Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XLI:1 (1973), 30-48.

An attempt to explore Biblical themes to see if the text requires sexist interpretation. Two basic discussions: Genesis 2-3 and the Song of Songs.

Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
Gives an excellent survey of the place of women in Old Testament societies. Oriented toward social institutions.

Verkhovskag, S. "Creation of Man and the Establishing of the Family in the Light of the Book of Genesis," St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, VIII:1 (1964), 5-30.

Vidberg, Fleming H. "The Canaanitic Background of Gen. I-III," Vetus Testamentum, X (1960), 285-294.

Vogels, W. "L'Universalisme de la Préhistoire Gen. 1-4," Église et Théologie, II:1 (1971), 5-54.

Vos, Clarence J. Women in Old Testament Worship. Delft: Judels en Brinkman, 1968.

Westermann, Claus. Genesis (Biblischer Kommentar 1/4) Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970.

Zacklad, Jean. "Création, péché originel et formalisme (Gen. I-III)," Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, LI:1 (1970), 1-30.

B. The Position of Women in Paganism and Judaism

Baer, Richard A. Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Important for understanding the symbolic use of the word 'woman' among the church fathers.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. Roman Women: Their History and Habits. London: Bodley Head, 1962.

Baron, S. A Social and Religious History of the Jews. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Blank, J. "Abbu Kultischer Sexualtabus und überholter Machstrukturen," Diakonia, II (1971), 105-109.

This short article throws light on the background material used in the chapter on Orthodox canon law.

- Brown, P. "Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy," Roman Studies, LI (1961), 1-11.
- Chrysostom, John. Homilies on Acts and Romans (J. Walker, J. Sheppard, and H. Browne, trs. and eds. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Series I, Vol. XI) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- Darmsteter, Arsène. The Talmud, tr. Henrietta Szold. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, n.d.
Essential for understanding the position of women in Jewish life in the first five or six centuries A.D.
- Donaldson, James. Woman: Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome and Among the Early Christians. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
See the review of this in Expository Times, XVIII, 246.
- Douglas, Mary. Purity and Danger. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.
Considerable material on sexual taboos and their relation to worship in the ancient world and in other religions. Material on the passages in Leviticus on which the Orthodox canons against menstruating women receiving communion are based.
- Duff, J. Wright. "The Position of Roman Women in the Imperial Peace, A.D. 70-192," in Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1939. XI, Ch. 19, pt. 3, pp. 752-755.
- Fink, M. I. "The Silent Women of Rome," Horizon, VII (1965), 57-64.
- Hooker, Richard. Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. 2 vols. New York: Dutton, 1907.
- Jeremias, Joachim. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- Kittel, Gerhard. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, tr. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromily. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
The most complete set of word studies available in English. It includes not only derivations but also substantial essays on the meanings of words in their various New Testament uses.
- Küng, Hans. The Church, tr. Ray and Rosaleen Ockenden. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1967.
Excellent studies on the institutional form of the early church and the theological implications of that for church life today.
- Lagrange, M.-J. St. Paul Épître aux Romains. Paris: Gabalda, 1950.
- Last, Hugh. "The Social Reforms of Augustus and Their Effect on Marriage and Women," in Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1939. X, Ch. 14, pt. 4-8, pp. 439-445.

Leipoldt, J. Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum. Gütersloh: Mohr, 1962.

Loewe, R. The Position of Women in Judaism. London: SPCK, 1966.

MacDonald, Elizabeth. The Position of Women as Reflected in Semitic Codes of Law. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1931.

Peck, Harry Thurston, ed. The Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities. New York: Harper & Bros., 1897.

Most entries are listed under the Greek or Latin word, not the English equivalent. The largest one volume classical dictionary, it has articles on the position of women in antique social structure and law.

Wahl, J. The Exclusion of Women from Holy Orders (Studies in Sacred Theology, end series, No. 110) Washington: Catholic University of America, 1959.

Presents an ultimately negative conclusion, based on the lack of any positive command of Christ to ordain women.

L'Histoire mondiale de la femme. Vol. I. Paris, 1965.

This book has three relevant chapters: "La femme dans Israel," by J. Bartero; "La femme en Grèce," by R. Flachelière, pp. 267-374; and "La femme à Rome dans la civilisation romaine," by P. Grimal, pp. 375-485. I list it last in this section as editor and publisher were unavailable.

C. Jesus' Attitude Toward Women

Jesus' specific actions toward women are very seldom appealed to in the debate over whether women should be ordained. There are several reasons for this: 1. Jesus was not concerned with making anybody a priest with special powers. 2. He was freer than his own culture, and most of his actions toward women cut toward their freedom and acceptance on exactly the same basis as men. See the following:

Faxon, Alicia Craig. Women and Jesus. Philadelphia: United Church Press, 1973.

Leipoldt, J. Jesus und die Frauen: bilder aus der Sittengeschichte der Alten Welt. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1921.

Southard, Madeline. The Attitudes of Jesus Toward Women. New York: George H. Doran, 1927.

Swidler, Leonard. "Jesus was a Feminist," Catholic World, CCXII:1270 (1971), 177-183.

D. Paul

1. General Discussion of Paul's Position

Allmen, J.-J. von. "Maris et femmes d'après Saint Paul," Cahiers Théologique, XXIX Neuchatel-Paris, 1951.

A standard presentation of the arguments against the ordination of women. Von Allmen concentrates on the idea that woman is an image of the church and man an image of Christ.

Caird, J. B. "Paul and Women's Liberty," Bulletin of John Rylands Library, XLIV:2 (1972), 268-97.

Pungent discussion attempting to show that Paul did not unthinkingly accept the idea of women's subordination but, in fact, strongly questioned it.

Carle, Paul-Laurent. "La femme et le ministères selon l'écriture," Nova et Vetra, XLVII:3 (1972), 161-87.

Opposes the ordination of women on several grounds, including the lack of their inclusion in the great commission of Matthew 28:18 and the necessarily complementary nature of man and woman "in Christ" which prevents them from being the same thing there.

Dibelius, M. "Von Stellung und Dienst der Frau im Neuen Testament," Die Theologie, Heft 3 (1942),

Feuillet, A. "La Dignité et le rôle de la femme d'après quelques textes Pauliniens: Comparaison avec L'Ancien Testament," New Testament Studies, XXI (1975), 157-191.

Discusses the concept of "glory" in I Corinthians 11:7, "silence" in I Corinthians 14:33b-36, the marriage of man and woman compared with Christ and the church in Ephesians 5:22-23, and compares all of these concepts with Hosea and the Song of Songs. Gives a very positive assessment of both Jesus' and Paul's ideas about women.

Ford, Patrick J. "Paul the Apostle: Male Chauvinist?" Biblical Theology Bulletin, V (1975), 302-311.

Greiner, Albert. "La place de la femme d'après le témoignage de l'écriture," Positions luthériennes, II (1954)

Hall, Barbara. "Paul and Women," Theology Today, XXXI:1 (1974), 50-55. Slight, but a passable first introduction to the arguments that Paul was really favorable to women.

Harrington, Wilfred. "St. Paul and the Status of Women," Australasian Catholic Record, L (1973), 39-50.

Actually a quick survey of the Biblical evidence about the position of women, especially as it finds its full expression in Paul.

Kähler, Else. Die Frau in den Paulischen Briefen, unter besonderer Beruchsechtigung des Begriffes der Unterordnung. Zürich/Frankfort: Gotthelf, 1960.

This book is the most complete examination of the Pauline texts I know about. A very careful, scholarly study that ought to be basic for us.

Leenhärdt, F. J. "La place de la femme dans l'Église d'après le Nouveau Testament," Études théologiques et religieuses, No. 1 (Montpillier, 1948).

The first major exegetical work by a reformed protestant theologian on the continent favorable to the ordination of women.

Longstaff, Thomas R. W. "The Ordination of Women, a Biblical Perspective," Anglican Theological Review, LVII (1975), 316-326.

Menoud, P.-H. "Sainte Paul et la femme," Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie, XIX:5 (1968), 318-30.

A balanced article examining Paul's own marital status and his views on marriage, his opinions on the silence of women in the church, and the submission of wives to their husbands. He leaves Paul a subordinationist, but a chastened one.

Miller, Calvin. "St. Paul and the Liberation of Women," Christianity Today, XV:22 (1971), 999-1000.
Slight.

Pagels, Elaine H. "Paul and Women: A Response to Recent Debate," Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XLII:3 (1974), 538-549.

A reply, especially to Scroggs' article "Paul and the Eschatological Woman." She sees Paul as a man at conflict with himself over the liberation of women.

Raurell, F. "St. Paul, fut-il misogyne et antifeministe?" Études Françaises, XV (1965), 66-73. October Supplement.

Robbins, Irene M. "St. Paul and the Ministry of Women," Expository Times, XLVI:4 (1935), 185-88.

Scroggs, Robin. "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XL (1972), 283-303.

Argues that Paul is a consistent defender of woman's rights. Includes a careful literary analysis of the pauline passages, especially I Corinthians 7, 11:2-12, Ephesians 5.

_____. "Paul and the Eschatological Woman Revisited," Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XLII:3 (1974), 532-537.

Mainly concerned with defending the above article, especially its interpretation of I Corinthians 11:2-16.

Sparrow-Simpson, W. J. Saint Paul on the Ministry of Women. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. München: Beck, 1954.

Indispensable for the Jewish background. See especially:

Vol. III, pp. 432-43 (I Corinthians 11:2-16)
pp. 467-69 (I Corinthians 14:33b-36)
pp. 645-46 (I Timothy 2:12-14)

Thomas W. Derek. "The Place of Women in the Church at Philippi," Expository Times, LXXXIII:4 (1972), 117-20.

Attempts to show that women were congregational leaders at Philippi.

Thrall, Margaret E. The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood: A Study of the Biblical Evidence. London: SCM Press, 1958.

The earliest full scale examination of the Biblical evidence that I know of by an Anglican. Attempts to show that the Genesis accounts picture two different orders of creation: Genesis 1, which is perfect, and Genesis 2 which is imperfect and transitory. The church should model itself on the perfect model which asserts the mutuality of men and women in all things. Genesis 2 describes the growth of the situation as it is, including the fall in Genesis three. The advent of Christ re-opened the possibility of going from Genesis 2 to Genesis 1. Paul was afraid of the paganising influence of women and refused to realize this possibility. His fears are no longer valid, and women ought to be admitted to the full ministry of the church.

Woodruff, Marguerite. "Underlying Factors Contributing to Paul's Teaching Concerning Women." Doctor's Dissertation, Southwest Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas, July, 1949.

London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958.

2. Articles on I Corinthians 11:2-16

Allo, E.-B. Première Épître aux Corinthiens. Paris: Gabalda, 1956.

For material on I Corinthians 11:2-16, see pp. 253-268. See my appendix for a translation of the excursus on I Corinthians 11:10. Allo opts for the theory that the veil is a sign of the authority the woman shares with the man. He rejects Kittel's theory about the origin of the word 'authority'. See pp. 371 f. for material on I Corinthians 14:33; a translation of this is also in my appendix.

Aristophanes. "Lysistrata," in his The Plays of Aristophanes, tr. B. B. Rodgers. (Loeb Classical Library) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

See pp. 246-258 for material on I Corinthians 11:2-16. See pp. 330-334 for material on I Corinthians 14:33-36. A good basic study of the passages; summarizes earlier scholarship. Does not directly apply the passages to the ordination of women.

- Baumegarter, J. M. "On the Testimony of Women in 1QSa," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (1957), 266-69.
- Bedale, Stephen. "The Meaning of ~~'κεφαλη'~~ in the Pauline Epistles," Journal of Theological Studies, V:2 (1954), 211-14.
Traces the different metaphorical meanings of "headship" in the ancient world and warns against importing modern metaphorical meanings of this word into the interpretation of ancient literature.
- Bornhäuser, D. "'Um der Engel Willen' 1 Kor. XI.10," Neue Kirckliche Zeitschrift, XLI (1930), 475-488.
- Boucher, Madeleine. "Some Unexplored Parallels to 1 Cor. 11,11-12 and Galatians 3,28: The New Testament and the Role of Women," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXXI (1969), 50-58.
- Brun, L. "'Um der Engel Willen' 1 Kor. XI-10," Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XIV (1913), 298-308.
- Conzelmann, Hans. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, tr. James Whitcomb. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
An excellent commentary. See pp. 181-191 for I Corinthians 11:1-16 and p. 246 for I Corinthians 14:33b-36.
- Dittenberger, W., ed. Sylloge Inscriptiones Graecorum. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1920.
Contains comparative material from the Andia Mysteries on the way Greek women wore their hair at religious ceremonies.
- Epictetus. The Discourses, as Reported by Arrian, tr. W. A. Oldfather. (Loeb Classical Library) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Feuillet, A. "Le Signe de puissance sur la tête de la femme," Nouvelle Revue Théologique, XCV (1973), 945-954.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of I Corinthians XI.10," New Testament Studies, IV (1957/58), 48-58.
Good survey of previous interpretations. Suggests tentatively that the angels are guardians of a natural order that is broken when married women are not veiled.
- Ginsburger, M. "La 'gloire' et l'autorité' de la femme dans 1 Cor. XI. 1-10," Revue D'Histoire et de philosophie Religieuses, XII (1932), 248.
- Greeven, H. "Der Mann ist des Weibes Haupt," Die Neue Furche, Heft 2 (1952),
- Haulotte, E. "Symbolique du vêtement selon la Bible," Paris: Aubier, 1966.

Herklotz, J. "Zu 1 Kor. XI.10," Biblische Zeitschrift, X (1912), 154.
A single paragraph that anticipates Kittel's argument.

Hooker, M. D. "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor. 11:10," New Testament Studies, X (1963/64), 410-16.

Sees the head covering as effecting man's authority over the woman; consequently it is necessary in worship where she is directly under the authority of God. Uses much evidence from contemporary Judaism.

Hurd, John Coolidge. The Origin of First Corinthians. New York: Seabury, 1965.

Basically a literary and form critical essay. Hurd tries to reconstruct the history of Paul's relations and conflicts with the Corinthian church by reconstructing the history of his correspondence.

Hurley, J. B. "Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women? A Consideration of 1 Cor. XI.2-16 and 1 Cor. XIV.33b-36," Westminster Theological Journal, XXXV (1973), 190-220.

A conservative method of Biblical interpretation seeks to find a more liberal conclusion than is traditional.

Isaksson, A. Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple: A Study with Special Reference to Mt. 19:3-12 and 1 Cor. 11:3-16. Lund: Gleerup, 1965.

An extensive exegesis of this passage with much material drawn from contemporary Judaism to help determine the context of Paul's ideas.

Jaubert, Annie. "Le Voile des femmes (1 Cor. XI.2-16)," New Testament Studies, XVIII (1972), 419-430.

A very clear and useful article.

Jeremias, A. Der Schlier von Sumner bis Heute (Der Alte Orient 31/1-2) Leipzig: Hinsichts, 1931.

Jirku, A. "Die 'Macht' auf dem Haupte (1 Kor. XI.10)," Neue Kirckliche Zeitschrift, XXXII (1922), 711.

Lietzmann, Hans. An die Korinther I/II. Tübingen: Mohr, 1949.

A standard German commentary.

Lösch, S. "Christliche Frauen in Corinth (1 Kor. XI.2-16): Ein neuer Lösungscersuch," Theologische Quartalschrift, CXXVII (1947), 419-430.

Martin, W. J. "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation" in W. W. Gasque and B. A. Martin (eds.) Apostolic History and the Gospel Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.

Matta, Othaniel. "The Question of the Unveiled Woman (1 Cor. XI.2-16)," Expository Times, XLIV (1932-33), 139-141.

Menander. "Periceriromene" in Menander, The Principle Fragments, tr. Francis Allison (Loeb Classical Library) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

- Mezzacasa, J. "Propter Angelos (1 Cor. XI,10)," Verbum Domini, XI (1931), 39-42.
- Moffatt, James. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
An older commentary with an excellent history of the published literature up to the time of writing. Summarizes research for the period 1860-1938.
- Morris, W. D. "1 Cor. 11:10," Expository Times, XXXIX (1927-28), 139.
- Perdelwitz, R. "Die ~~ἐξουσία~~ auf dem Haupt der Frau," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, LXXXVI (1913), 64-73.
- Ramsey, W. The Cities of St. Paul. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907.
One of the earliest to see that the veil did not represent the power of the husband over the woman, but some power she holds in her own right.
- Riedel, William, ed. The Canons of Athanasius. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1973.
Canon 74. "An adulteress, when she shall do penance, shall be shorn of her hair . . ." Presumably as a sign of shame.
- Roesch, K. "Um der Engel Willen (1 Kor. XI.10)," Theologie und Glaube, XXIV (1932), 363-5.
- Rose, P. "Power on Her Head," Expository Times, XXIII (1911-12), 183-4.
- Schmithals, Walter. Gnosticism in Corinth. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971.
See especially pp. 237-245.
- Spicq, C. "Encore la 'puissance sur la tête'," Revue Biblique, XLVIII (1939), 557-562.
Adopts a decidedly subordinationist interpretation. The veil is a sign that the woman is the property of her husband.
- Synge, F. C. "Studies in Texts: 1 Cor. 11:2-16," Theology, LVI (1953), 143.
Just a paragraph.
- Vaux, R. de. "Sur le voile des femmes dans l'Orient Ancien," Revue Biblique, XLIV:3 (1935), 397-412.
A discussion of the customs and meanings of veiling in the ancient world.
- Walker, William O., Jr. "1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and Paul's Views Regarding Women," Journal of Biblical Literature, XCIV (1975), 95f.
- Weber, W. "Die paulinische Vorschrift über die Kopfbedeckung der Christen," Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, XLVI (1903), 487-99.

Wells, N. "Of Silence and Head Covering," Westminster Theological Journal, XXXIV:1 (1972), 21-27.

Wilson, J. D. "1 Cor. 11:10," Expository Times, XXXIX (1927-28), 283-84.

3. Articles on I Corinthians 14:33b-36

Aalen, S. "A Rabbinic Formula in 1 Cor. 14,34," Studia Evangelica, II (1964), 513.

Ambrosiaster. Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Corinthians. (Patrologia Latina, Vol. 17, c. 273).

Dielkamp-Hoffmann, L. Theologiae Dogmaticae manuale. 1946.

Fitzer, G. Das Weib schweige in der Gemeinde? Über den unpaulinischer Charakter der 'mulier tacet' Verse in 1 Korinther 14. (Theologische Existence Heute, N.F. 110) München, 1963.

Hommes, N. J. "Let Women be Silent in Church: A Message Concerning the Worship Services and the Decorum to be Observed by Women," Calvin Theological Journal, IV:1 (1969), 5-22.

Uses very conservative methods of interpretation.

Kosmala, H. "Gedanken zur Kontroverse Farbenstein-Hoch," Judaica, IV (1948), 234.

Labriolle, P. "Mulieres taceant in ecclesia," Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes, I (1911), 3-24.

A study of the prohibition on women speaking in church as a means of fighting heresy, especially Montanism.

Lercher, L. Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae. Innsbruck: Universität Theologische Fakultät, 1950.

Robertson, A., and A. Plummer. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.

Sola, D. Sacra Theologiae Summa. (Bibliotheca de Authores Christianos, Vol. LXXIII, No. 4) Madrid: Bibliotheca de Authores Christianos, 1953.

Windisch, Hans. "Sinn und Geltung des apostolischen 'mulier taceat in ecclesia'," Christliche Welt, XLIV (1930), col. 411-425.

4. Articles on I Timothy 2:11-15.

Dibelius, Martin. The Pastoral Epistles, revised, Hans Conzelmann, tr. Phillip Buttolph and Adela Yarbo. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

This classic form-critical commentary connects this passage with anti-gnostic polemic. Much comparative material on Greek and other ancient cultures; good bibliography.

Easton, Burton Scott. The Pastoral Epistles. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.

See pp. 119-129.

Engel, G. "Let Women Learn in Silence," Expository Times, XVI (1904-05), 188-189.

Falconer, Sir Robert. "1 Timothy 2:14,15. Interpretative Notes." Journal of Biblical Literature, LX (1941), 375-378.

Explores differences between this verse and pauline thought. Presents it as full of second generation ideas, more rigid and more oriented toward this world than the truly pauline letters.

Galles, T. "Non est creatus vir propter mulierem, sed mulier propter virum," Verbum Domini, XXII (1942), 141-151.

Gibson, Margaret. "Let the Woman Learn in Silence," Expository Times, XV (1903-04), 379-80.

Hick, Ludwig. Stellung des heilige Paulus zu Frau in Rahmen seinen Zeit. Cologne: Amerikanisch-Ungarischer Verlag, 1957.

Jebbs, S. "A Suggested Interpretation of 1 Tim. 2:15," Expository Times, LXXXI (1969-70), 221-222.

Labriolle, P. Sources de l'histoire du Montanisme. Fribourg: O'Geschwend, 1913.

Spencer, A. D. B. "Eve at Ephesus: Should Women be Ordained as Pastors according to the 1st Letter to Timothy 2:11-15?" Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, XVII:4 (1974), 215-222.

Spicq, P. C. Saint Paul: Les Épîtres Pastorales. Paris: Gabilda, 1947. See for I Timothy 2:11-15, pp. 70-74; for the excursus on deacons and deaconesses pp. 98-103; and for widows pp. 165-75. The section on I Timothy 2:11-15 is translated in the appendix.

Williams, H. H. "Let the Woman Learn in Silence," Expository Times, XVI (1904-05), 189-90.

A reply to Margaret Gibson's articles. The three articles by Gibson, Williams and Engels form part of the earliest stage of debate about ministerial positions for women in the Anglican church.

5. Articles on Galatians 3:28

Aland, Kurt, ed. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, tr. Bruce Metzgar. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1972.
Contains the Gospel of Thomas.

Armstrong, George D. Christian Doctrine of Slavery. New York: Scribners, 1857.

Augustine, A. The City of God, tr. Marcus Dodds. New York: Modern Library, 1950.

Bauer, Walter. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, tr. William F. Arndt and F. Wilber Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Betz, Hans Dieter. "Galatians 3:28." Tape 779a. School of Theology at Claremont Library tape collection.

An exegetical discussion of the meaning of "neither man nor woman," set against the background of Hellenistic views of the nature of sexuality. A very valuable introduction.

_____. "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians." Paper in the School of Theology at Claremont Library vertical file.

Bonnard, Pierre. L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates. Paris: Delachaux et Nestle, 1972.
See especially p. 78.

Bornkamm, Günther. Paul. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
Has a most useful section on Paul's conceptions of baptism and the sacraments in general. See also the discussion of the meaning of being in Christ.

Crem, P. R. "Il n'ya plus juif ni grec . . .," Lumière Vie, XVIII:92 (1969), 113-129.

Deals specifically with overcoming the Jew-Greek distinction, but the general remarks are useful for understanding the form and origins of denial-of-distinctions language in general.

Cullmann, Oscar. "Dissension within the Early Church," in New Testament Issues. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Grail, Augustine O. P. "Le Baptême dans L'Épître aux Galates, (III,26-IV,7)." Revue Biblique, LVIII:4 (1951), 503-20.

Hennecke, E. New Testament Apocrypha, Wilhelm Schneemelcher (ed.), tr. R. McL. Wilson. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
The apocrypha are very rich material on women, and a separate monograph of considerable substance could be written about their reflections on woman's place in the first centuries.

Jenkins, William Sumner. Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South. Gloucester, Ma.: Peter Smith, 1960.

Lactantius. Divinae Institutionis, tr. A. Cleveland Coxe. (In a Select Library of Nicene and Anti-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Vol. 7) Buffalo: Christian Literature Co., 1886.

Lagrange, J. Saint Paul, Épître aux Galates. Paris: Gabalda, 1918.

Ligasse, S. "Foi et Baptême chez Saint Paul: Études de Galates. 3:26-27," Bulletin Littérature Ecclésiastique, LXXIV:2 (1973), 81-102.

Pohlenz, Max. Die Stoa, Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1948-49.

Schlier, H. Der Brief an die Galater. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962.

Stamm, Raymond. "Galatians" in The Interpreter's Bible. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953. X, 429-593.

Stendahl, Krister. The Bible and the Role of Women. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Originally written as part of the controversy over the ordination of women in the Church of Sweden, this work asks fundamental questions about the proper method of interpreting the Bible for use in setting modern church policy. It is one of the few competent exegetical works that also appreciates the philosophical and logical sides of this problem. Strongly pro-women's ordination on the ground that Galatians 3:28 represents the heart of the Gospel.

Xenophon. On the Constitution of the Lacedaemonians, ed. and tr. G. W. Bowersock. (Loeb Classical Library) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

E. Articles on the General Question of Women and Office in the Bible

Blum, G. G. "The Office of Women in the New Testament," Churchman, LXXXV:3 (1971), 175-189.

Bruyere, E. Le NT et un ministère d'autorité pour la femme. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1970.
See pp. 93-101.

Dumas, A. "Deux études oecumeniques sur la femme selon la Bible dans L'Église," Jeunes Femmes, IV:4 (1953)
I have not been able to locate this article. It has been very influential in Europe, especially among French Protestants.

Florentin-Smyth, Françoise. "Ce que la Bible ne dit pas de la femme," Études Théologiques et Religieuses, II (1965), 76-89.

An excellent article that puts to rest many misconceptions about the Biblical notions of woman's place. It approaches the Bible holistically, rather than treating verses as isolated units. Very sensitive to changed perceptions of the world.

Ford, J. Massyngberde. "Biblical Material Relevant to the Ordination of Women," Journal of Ecumenical Studies, X (1973), 669-694.

Assesses the negative texts and rejects them; asks for the ordination of women on the grounds of the concept of universal priesthood in Hebrews.

Grelot, P. Le couple humain dans l'écriture. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1969.

_____. Le Ministère de la Nouvelle Alliance. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1967.

Has a chapter on women and Holy Orders

Hanson, Paul D. "Masculine Metaphors for God and Sex-Discrimination in the Old Testament," The Ecumenical Review, XXVII:4 (1975), 316f.

Kähler, Else. "Zur 'unterordnung' der Frau im Neuen Testament," Zeitschrift für Evangelische Ethik, I (1959), 1 ff.

Maetens, Thierry. La promotion de la femme dans la Bible. Paris: Casterman, 1967.

There is an English translation of this work which I have not seen.

Meeks, Wayne A. "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," History of Religions, XIII:3 (1974), 165-208.

An extremely useful article, full of comparisons of religious movements contemporary with the New Testament, New Testament material and Hellenistic philosophy. It attempts to explore the basic notions of sexuality in the ancient world and so goes beyond the usual articles that just explore what people said and did. Meeks attempts a rational and synthetic account of the religious dynamics behind the place of women in the early church.

Molan, G. "Toward a Biblical Understanding of Womanhood," Ministry, VIII (1968), 3-9. (Marija, Lesotho).

Moule, C. F. D. "Ordination of Women," Expository Times, LXX:6 (1959), 166-167.

A review of Margaret Thrall's book, The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood. Moule is sceptical of some of Thrall's results, but thinks she has proved enough to carry her main point, that nothing in the Bible forbids the ordination of women but supports it.

Reumann, J. P. H. "What in Scripture Speaks to the Ordination of Women?" Concordia Theological Monthly, XLIV (1973), 5-30.

Riesenfeld, Harald. "The Ministry in the New Testament" in The Root of the Vine: Essays in Biblical Theology. Westminster, England: Dacre Press, 1953.

See pp. 123-127.

Sakenfeld, Katherine. "The Bible and Women: Bane or Blessing?" Theology Today, XXXII:3 (1975), 222-233.

Schuermans, Marie-Phillipe, OSB. "Vocation de la femme dans la Bible," Vie Spirituel, DLVII (1969), 149-165.

Stockton, E. D. "The Woman: A Biblical Theme," Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology, II:2 (1973), 106-112.

Vinatier, J. "La femme, Parole de Dieu et amenir de l'homme. Approches bibliques avec un appel aux évêques pour ministères féminins." Recherche et Recontres. Paris: Ed. Ouvrieres, 1972.

Williams, Jay G. "Yahweh, Woman and the Trinity," Theology Today, XXXII:3 (1975)

F. Patristic Writings

1. Primary Sources

Chrysostom, John. Homilies on Acts and Romans, tr. J. Walker, J. Shepherd, H. Browne. (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Vol. 11) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.

See especially the commentary on the last chapter of Romans.

_____. Homilies on Corinthians. (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Vol. 12) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.

See I Corinthians 11:2-16 and 14:33-36.

_____. Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philipians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus and Philemon. Numerous trans. (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Vol. 13) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.

See the commentaries on Galatians 3:28 and on I Timothy 2:12-15 and 5:1-17.

_____. Lettres à Olympias: Introduction et Traduction, tr. Anne-Marie Maligrey. (Sources Chrétiennes, Vol. 13) Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1947.

This volume contains the best introduction to the Chrysostom-Olympia correspondence that I know about. Excellent analysis of the historical background, but not much on the actual use of the letters to reconstruct Olympia's and Chrysostom's relationship.

- _____. On the Priesthood, tr. W. R. W. Stephen. (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Vol. 9) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- _____. Select Homilies and Letters, tr. W. R. W. Stephen. (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
This volume contains about 1/4 of the Chrysostom-Olympia correspondence in English. The nine letters translated miss some of the most interesting material for our question.
- Clement of Alexandria. Christ the Educator, tr. Simon P. Woods. (Fathers of the Christian Church) New York: Fathers of the Christian Church, 1954.
- _____. "Stromata," ed. J. E. L. Oulton and Henry Chadwick in Alexandrine Christianity. (Library of Christian Classics) Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.
This contains a translation of Stromata III which deals with Clement's views on marriage and women. It is a good starting point for trying to make some connections between practical rules of behavior and the philosophical suppositions behind them. Clement's stoicism shows plainly.
- Connolly, R. Hugh, ed. and tr. Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.
A very useful introduction and an index that really allows you to find the topic you want.
- Epiphanius of Salamis. Adversus Haereses (Panarion). (Patrologiae Graecae, Vol. 42) c. 740ff.
The longest discussion of women in priesthood in Patristic literature.
- Gregory of Nazianzen. "On His Sister Saint Gorgonia," tr. Leo P. McCauley in Funeral Orations by St. Gregory Nazianzus and St. Ambrose. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1953.
- Gregory of Nyssa. "De opificio hominis," tr. and ed. Werner Jaeger, in his Opera Omnia. Leiden: Brill,
- _____. The Life of St. Macrina, tr. Virginia Woods Callahan. (Fathers of the Church) Howard University: Catholic University of America Press, 1967.
- _____. Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius, ed. Werner Jaeger. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Isho' Dad of Merv. The Commentaries of Isho' Dad of Merv., tr. Margaret Dunlop Gibson. (Horae Semiticae No. XI, Vol. 5, part 2) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916.

- Migne, Jacques Paul, ed. Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Paris: Lutetiae, 1857-66.
- Origen of Alexandria. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. (Patrologia Graeca, Vol. 14)
- _____. Commentary on the Song of Songs, tr. R. P. Lawson. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1957.
- Palladius. Palladii dialogus de vita s. Joannis Chrysostomi, ed. P. R. Coleman-Norton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928. Just the Greek text.
- _____. The Lausiac History, tr. and ed. Robert Meyer. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1965.
- Parisot, D. Ioannes, ed. Patrologia Syriaca. Paris: Didot, 1894.
- Polycarp of Smyrna. "The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians," in The Apostolic Fathers, ed. Kirsopp Lake. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. I, 282-301.
- Sozomen. Historia Ecclesiastica. (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd series, Vol. II) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- Tertullian. "Ad Uxorum," tr. William P. LeSaint in Treatises on Marriage and Re-Marriage. (Ancient Christian Writers) Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1956.
- _____. De Baptismo, ed. S. Thewell. (The Anti-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. 11) Edinburgh: Clark, 1869.
- _____. De cultu feminarum, ed. S. Thewell (ANCL Vol. 11).
- _____. De virginibus velandis, ed. S. Thewell (ANCL Vol. 18).
- _____. Exhortation to Chastity, ed. S. Thewell (ANCL Vol. 18).

For anyone wishing to research the Patristic literature further, I suggest the following references and writings as possible starters. All relate to the position of women in some way in early Christian life and thought. They are not included in this study because of lack of time and space.

Methodius of Olympia, Symposium. A most interesting treatise modeled on the Symposium of Plato. The topic of discussion is the true meaning of virginity. Methodius wants to define virginity at least as much in terms of the nature of one's relation to God as one's physical state. All the characters in this work are women.

Augustine, Commentary on the Lord's Sermon on the Mount. Check the split attitude toward women in Book 1, Chapter 15.

John Chrysostom, De Virginitate. These are two pastoral letters on Virgines Subintroductae. Chrysostom was trying to stamp out a practice he saw as a serious abuse and in the process explains some of his feelings about women and the church.

Jerome's Epistles are a gold mine. Over 1/3 of them, and many of the longer ones, are to women. See Epistles 75, 133, 84, 123, 48, 107, 22, 54, 108, 117, 79, etc. Also, see his Commentary on Ephesians 5. He explicitly draws the contrast between body and soul as parallel to that between Christ and the Church, man and woman. "If she wished to serve Christ more than the world she will cease to be a woman and will be called Man." The whole history of his friendship with Melania needs to be explored.

Ambrose has some very important things to say. See his Commentary on Luke PL. 15, cc. 1844ff. and cc. 1936-37. His sermons on the creation might bear looking into.

Ambrosiaster has material in his commentaries on Paul, I Corinthians 11, I Timothy 2 and I Timothy 3:11. Specifically, he denies the possibility of ordaining women in the last reference. PL. Vol. 17 col. 460, 494, 496, 25.

The numerous works on virginity might bear looking into. I would start with Gregory of Nyssa as he tends to go to the heart of a subject.

There is another kind of primary source, early Christian art work and inscriptions. See the following:

Diehl, E. Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres I. n.1192.
On presbytera.

Gregory the Great. Dialoges, IV, 11, cf. Epistle IX, 7.

Grossi-Gondi. Trattato di epigrafica cristiana, p. 153, n.1.

Marini, G. Inscriptiones Christianae. Museum Vat. 9072, pt. II,
Chapter XXII, no. 1, 1608 (1904).

Rossi, J. B. Mosaici Cristiani delle Chiese di Roma. Rome: Libreria
Spithover de G. Haass, 1899.
See vol. 7, p. 4 of the notes for plate XXVI of the mosaics of the
"Oratio de S. Zenone."

Scaglia, Sisto. Notiones archaeologiae christianae II (1) 195.
Sees widows as special officers in their communities.

Corpus inscriptionum. Berlin; 1905. Vol. 10, n. 5902, Vol. 3, n.
14900.
Examples of the use of Episcopa.

In The Lady Was a Bishop, Morris mentions a fresco, "Fractio Panis," in the Capella Breca of the Catacombs of Priscilla in the Via Salerio Nova,

Rome. This fresco is supposed to show what may be a woman heading a eucharistic meal for the dead. Morris neglects to footnote this, so I cannot check her statement and have been unable to find a description of the fresco. Some of the above bibliography comes from her book, but I have been unable to check most of her material. However, see F. Cabrol and Henri Leclercuf, eds. Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie. Tome I, col. 797-798 for a description and illustration of this fresco.

2. Secondary Sources

Achelis, H. Virgines Subintroductae, Ein Beitrag zum VII Kapitel des I Korintherbriefs. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902.

Attwater, Donald. St. John Chrysostom: Pastor and Preacher. London: Harvill Press, 1959.

Baily, D. Sherwin. The Man-Woman Relation in Christian Thought. London: Longmans, Green, 1959.

Bangerter, Otto. Frauen im Aufbruch. Neukircher-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971.

A detailed examination of the position of women in the early church. More extensive than Daniélou.

Bauer, Chrysostomus. John Chrysostom and His Times, tr. Sr. M. Gonzaga. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1959.

A two volume study covering every aspect of Chrysostom's life.

Bauer is, unfortunately, blind to some of the questions about Chrysostom's relations with women. He even has the gall to say that the thanks the church owes to eminent women in the patristic period is for having such brilliant and important sons. See Vol. 1, p. 4.

Bopp, L. Das Witwenum als organische Gliedschaft im Gemeinschaftsleben der alten Kirchen. Mannheim: 1950.

Crouzel, Henri. Virginité et mariage selon Origene. Paris: Desclee de Brouwer, 1963.

Dacier, H. Saint Jean Chrysostome et la femme du quatrième siècle de l'église greque. Paris: Falque, 1907.

Daniélou, Jean. The Ministry of Women in the Early Church. London: Faith Press, 1961.

This article, translated from the French, is a basic examination of the position of women and one of the most used sources. I feel it is somewhat conservative and suffers from importing concepts about ministry and ordination from later times back into the earlier church.

Dietrich, E. B. Women in the Early Christian Ministry.

Eckstein, Lina. The Women of Early Christianity. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1935.

Gaith, Jérôme. La conception de la liberté chez Gregoire de Nysse. Paris: Librairie Philosophique, Vrin, 1953.

Gottlieb, Elfriede. Die Frau im Fruher Christentum. Leipzig: Klein, 1928.

_____. Die Frau in der fruhchristlichen Gemeinde. Berlin: Herbig, 1928.

Gryson, R. Le ministère des femmes dans l'église ancienne. (Recherches et Synthèses, Section d'histoire, IV) Gembloux: Duculot, 1972.
This is the most complete examination of women as actual ministers in the early church. Gryson does not consider the reasons why such restrictions as are present are there, but tries to establish the mere historical fact of the situation. His study is based entirely on direct textual evidence. See the review in Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, DXIX:1 (1974), 106.

Hanson, Sister Vincent Emmanuel. The Question of Women and the Priesthood. London: Chapman, 1967.

An historical study of the problem of the admission of women to orders in the Catholic Church. Very good stuff.

Hausheer, I., ed. Orientalia christiana analecta 144. Rome: Pontifical institutum orientalium studiorum. 1955.

See pages 251-258 for a listing of texts from the fathers that support women's equality with men.

Kalsbach, A. Die Altkirchliche Einrichtung der Diakonisse bis zu ihrem Erloschen. Friburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1926.

Klauser, Theodor. Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1957, 1972.

Excellent discussion of the position of the church fathers on women with listings of passages in the article "Frau" in Band VIII, p. 227-270. One of the longest and best discussions I have seen.

See also the article by A. Kalsbach, "Diakonisse," Band III, Col. 917-927.

Mayer, Josephine, ed. Monumenta de viduis diaconissis virginibusque tractantia. (Floriligiorem Patristicum, fasc, XLII) Bonn: Hanstein, 1938.

Meer, Haye van der. Women Priests in the Catholic Church? A Theological-Historical Investigation, tr. Arlene and Leonard Swidler. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1973.

Examines the question of whether there is any element in the Roman Catholic tradition that imposes an absolute negative on the ordination of women and concludes there is not. Explores scripture, patristic evidence, the history of councils and the teaching office,

medieval theology, especially Thomas Aquinas, and the various theological arguments the negative side has produced.

Metz, Rene. La Consécration des Vierges dans L'Eglise Romaine, Étude d'histoire de la liturgie. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954.

Mitchell, Leonard L. Baptismal Anointing. London: S.P.C.K., 1966.
This is one of the Alcuin Club pamphlets, and has a section on deaconesses as liturgical officers.

Morris, Joan. The Lady was a Bishop. New York: Macmillan, 1973.
Mainly concerned with the history and authority of abbesses. Especially strong in material from the early Middle Ages. Needs to be used with care, but a gold mine of information.

Niebuhr, Richard and D. D. Williams. The Ministry in Historical Perspective. New York: Harper, 1956.
Check the index under "ordination of women" and "deaconesses." The material is plentiful but somewhat scattered.

Quasten, J. Patrology, Vol. 2. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1950.

Reuther, Rosemary, ed. Religion and Sexism. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974.
This collection of essays covers the part women have played in nearly every aspect of religious life in the Christian and Judaic traditions since their beginnings. Some of the scholarship is very good indeed, for some one needs to be careful lest feminism obscure strict accuracy.

Roncaglia, Martiniano. Histoire de L'Eglise Copte. Liban: Dar-Al-Dalima, 1966.
A survey history of Christianity in Egypt from the earliest time to the present day. A multi-volume set. Volume 3 discusses the idea of church as mother, pp. 201-202.

Stocker, Lydia. Die Frau in der alten Kirche. Tübingen: Mohr, 1907.

Tavard, George. Women in Christian Tradition. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1973.
Again this book covers the entire gamut of the place of women in Christian traditions from the earliest times to the present day. Not concerned specifically with ordination, but it provides good background. Be careful with the conclusions he draws from his facts, sometimes he is a bit careless.

Tollinton, R. B. Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism. 2 Vols. London: William and Norgate, 1914.
See especially Vol. 1, pp. 252-58 and 270-302.

Vandenbergh, B. H. St. John Chrysostom and St. Olympias. London: 1959.
Most unfortunately, I was not able to locate this work

Wahl, Joseph A. The Exclusion of Women from Holy Orders. (Studies in Sacred Theology, Series 2, No. 110) Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1959.

Argues on a broad base for the exclusion of women from orders. Bases the patristic section on man's superiority to women in the natural order. Woman's calling is to motherhood.

Zerbst, Fritz. The Office of Women in the Church, tr. Albert G. Merrens. St. Louis: Concordia, 1955.

An examination of the possibility of ordaining women from the conservative Lutheran point of view. The negative conclusions are stated mainly through an orders of creation argument.

Zscharnack, L. Der Dienst der Frau in den ersten Jahrhunderten der chr. Kirche. Göttingen: Vandenhoech and Ruprecht, 1902.

This study comes to fairly radical conclusions about the practice of the early church. For instance, the author believes women led communion services in the first century. I believe it to be a distinct possibility, but unproven. See the review on Expository Times, Vol. 15, p. 111.

3. Periodical Literature

Brugge, D. "Le Diaconat de la femme," Vie Spirituelle, CXIV (1966), 184-202.

Carle, Paul Laurent. "La femme et les ministère pastoraux d'après la tradition," Nova et Vetera, XLVII:3 (1972), 263-290.
Negative argument drawn from tradition.

Casel, O. "Die Monstheueihe," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft, V (1925), 4f.

Congar, Yves. "Simples réflexions," Vie Consacrée, XLIV (1972), 310-14.
Congar maintains that the exclusion of women from priestly office is not just due to cultural conditioning but that it has not been proven to be Divine law either. So he would ordain women to the diaconate but not the priesthood until the issue becomes clearer.

Danvilliers, J. "La condition de la femme," in Les temps Apostoliques, Paris: Sirey, 1970.
See pp. 417-424.

Davies, J. G. "Deacons, Deaconesses and the Minor Orders in the Patristic Period," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XIV:1 (1963), 1-6.
Very conservative on the order of deaconesses. Rejects all mention of them in the New Testament as irrelevant to the question of an Order of Deaconesses, and sees them growing out of the male diaconate. His evidence on the latter point is weak.

- Delhay, Ph. "Rétrospective et prospective des ministères féminins dans l'Église: Reflexions a propos d'une livre de M. Gryson," Revue Théologique Louvain, III:1 (1972), 55-75.
- Edwards, O. C. Jr. "The Failure of the Ante-Nicene Church to Ordain Women and Its Significance for Today," The St. Luke's Journal of Theology, XVIII:4 (1975), 187-213.
- Fiery, J.-M. "Cenobitisme féminin ancien dans le Églises syriennes orientale et occidentale," L'Orient Syrien, X (1965), 281ff.
- Gryson, R. "L'Ordination des diaconesses d'après les Constitutions Apostoliques," Melanges Science Religieuse, XXXI (1974), 41-46.
- Kock, H. "Virgines Christi: die Gelubde der Gottgeweihten Jungfrauen in den erstes drei Jahrhunderten," in Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlicher Literatur. Series 2, Vol. 1, pp. 59-112.
- Labriolle, P. de. "Le Mariage spirituel dans l'Antiquité Chrétienne." Revue Historique, XLVI (1921), 204-225.
- Lafontaine, P. H. "Le sexe masculin: condition de l'accesion aux orders, aux IVE et Ve siècles," Revue de l'Université Ottawa, XXXI (1961), 137-182. Section spéciale.
- Lohr, A. "Der Typus der hl. Frau, die nicht Jungfrau ist, nach den Commune-Messen," Liturgische Zeitschrift, IV (1931-32), 464.
- Lowrie, S. T. "Women as Ruling Elders," Princeton Theological Review, XIX (1921), 113-130.
Rejects the idea that women have ever had positions of ruling authority in the church, so they cannot now.
- Ludwig, A. "Weibliche Kleriker in der Altchristlichen und fruhmittelalterlichen Kirche," Passauer Theol. Parkt. Monatschrift, (1910), 548-57, 609-17. Ibidem, 1911, 141-9.
- McLaughlin, Eleanor L. "The Christian Past: Does It Hold a Future for Women?" Anglican Theological Review, LVII (1975), 36-56.
Concerned with both the ancient church and the medieval period, this is the most sensible discussion of the re-writing of history from a perspective that does justice to women that I have seen. Asks for an investigation of the church at worship, not just one of the church at thought.
- Madden, P. "Women and Holy Orders: An Historical Survey," Resonance, VI:2 (1971-72), 9-32.
A fair and extensive survey of what women have actually done in the church liturgically. Concentrates on Rome and the East.

- Magne, Jean. "Le prière de consécration des vierges 'Deus Caslosum Conforum' Étude du Texte," Ephemerides Liturgicae, LXXII (1958), 254ff.
Merely traces the history and the technical aspects of the manuscript.
- Martimort, A.-G. "Apropos des ministères féminins dans L'Eglise," Bulletin de littérature Ecclésiastique, II (1973), 103-8.
- Meyer, C. B. "Ordained Women in the Early Church," Chicago Studies, IV (1965), 285-308.
Holds that women were really ordained to the diaconate in the early church.
- O'Rourke, J. "Women and the Reception of Orders." Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa, XXXVIII (1968), 290-98.
Summary of the evidence for the idea that women did receive a technical ordination in the early church.
- Segelberg, Eric. "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Phillip," Vigiliae Christianae, XV (1961), 129-140.
- Squire, A. K. "The Idea of the Soul as Virgin and Mother in Maximus Confessor," in F. L. Cross (ed.) Studia Patristica 8, pp. 456-461. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1966.
Arguments for Christ as the bridegroom of the church.
- Turner, C. H. "Ministries of Women in the Primitive Church: Widow, Deaconess, and Virgin," in H. W. Bates (ed.) Catholic and Apostolic. London: Mowbray, 1961.
- Winslow, Donald. "Priesthood and Sexuality in the Post-Nicene fathers." Paper given at the Conference of Anglican Theologians, Seabury-Western Seminary, April 2-5, 1975.
Winslow discusses Chrysostom and Gregory of Nyssa and Nazianzus. I am indebted to him for some of the ideas in my thesis. He lays bare the contradictions of the common Patristic position. A really valuable paper.

G. Canon Law

The complexity and confused nature of the sources for the study of canon law are famous. The field is specialized, obscure, has its own vocabulary and its own reference tools. I certainly do not have the specialist's knowledge to make use of these. Therefore the references in this section refer merely to those works I consulted in writing the Excursus on Canon Law in the Eastern Orthodox Church. The works in the first section are merely background studies of the figures involved and did not provide information directly involved in writing the chapter. Therefore I have used an abbreviated bibliographical entry.

Theodore Balsamon.

Beck. Kirche und theologische Literature im Byzantinischen Reich, pp. 70-73, 657-658 bibliography.

Herman. "Balsamon." Dictionnaire de droit canonique II:76-83.

Lampros. "Zwei Berichtigungen und Ergänzungen zu Rhallis-Potlis." Byzantinische Zeitschrift V (1896), 565-566.

Petit. "Balsmon." Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique 2.I:135-137.

Matthew Blastaris.

Beck. Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich, pp. 786-787.

Janin. Lexikon fur Theologie und Kirche VII:173.

Petit. "Blastaris." Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique 2.I:916-917.

John Zonaras.

Beck. Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich, pp. 656-657.

Herman. Dictionnaire de droit canonique VI:129.

Primary Sources.

Balsamon. Patrologia Graecae, CXIX: 904-909; CXXXVII; CXXXVIII.

Blastaris. Patrologia Graecae, CXLIV: 960-1400; CXLV:1-212.

Zonaras. Patrologia Graecae, CXXXVII: 38ff; CXXXVIII.

All of these are given in both Byzantine Greek and Latin. The Latin translations are quite easy to read. So far as I know, this is the only available translation of any of this material into any western language. Fragments are translated in the Pedalion, but never complete works.

Agapius and Nicodemus. The Rudder, or Pedalion, tr. D. Cummings.

Chicago: The Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1957.

This was my basic source, listing all the canons considered binding by the Orthodox Churches. It gives extracts of the medieval commentators dealing with each separate canon. The author is sometimes careless about informing the reader exactly when the quote stops and his own comments start. I have checked the accuracy of this work at every possible turn and find it generally quite accurate.

Feghali, Joseph. Histoire du droit de L'Eglise Maronite. Paris: Letouzey et Cie., 1962.
See especially pp. 41, 64, 67.

Perier, Jean. "Les 127 Canons des Apôtres." Patrologia Orientalis III. Paris, 1912.
See especially canon 19 and canon 33. They are against menstruating women being baptized and against women distributing communion.

Vööbus, A. Syrische Kanonessammlungen. Vol. I, Westsyrische Originalurkunde. (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium) Louvain, 1970.

This collection of Syrian canons enables one to trace the history of the restrictions on women down to the ninth century.

There are other collections which might be consulted: Hefele, Mansi (if you can find it). Haye van der Meer has a good introductory chapter on the Canon Law as it developed in the West. As I think a list of the main eastern canons relevant to this question might be useful, I include it.

John the Faster, Canon 17.
Dionysios of Alexandria, Canon 2.
Timothy of Alexandria, Canon 2.
Leo the Wise, Novel 17.
Basil the Great, Epitomized Definition no. 309.
1st Ecumenical Council, Canon 19.
6th Ecumenical Council, Canon 70. (Council in Trullo.)
4th Ecumenical Council, Canon 15.
Synod of Laodicea, Canon 44.

H. Medieval Materials

I have chosen to include a selection of medieval material that I discovered while doing background research. This section of the bibliography is merely intended to point in a most cursory way to a beginning list of readings in the area.

Bainton, R. H. Women of the Reformation in France and England. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1973.

_____. Women of the Reformation in Germany and Italy. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1971.

Bateson, Mary. Origin and Early History of Double Monasteries. (Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Vol. 13) London: Longmans Green, 1899.

Berliere, Usmer. "Les monastères doubles aux 12e et 13e C." (Mémoires publiées par l'Académie Royale de Belgique Classe des lettres 80, 2, 18) Bruxelles, 1923.

- Børresen, Elisabeth. Subordination et équivalence, Nature et rôle de la femme d'après Augustin et Thomas d'Aquin. Oslo-Paris: Universitets Forlaget, 1968.
- Brodersen, Erling H. Der Spender der Kommunion in Altertum und Mittelalter. (Studies in Sacred Theology, Series 2, No. 213) Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1970.
- Brooke, C. N. L. Gregorian Reform in Action: Clerical Marriage in England 1050-1200. (Change in Medieval Society, ed. Sylvia Thrupp) New York: Appleton, 1964.
- Browne, Peter. Beiträge zu Sexualethik des Mittel-Alters. (Studien zur historischer Theologie) Breslau: F. X. Seppelt. 1932.
- Eckenstein, Lima. Women under Monasticism: Chapters on Saintlore and Convent Life Between 500 and 1500 AD. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.
- Evans, J. M. Paradise Lost and the Genesis Tradition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
The history of the interpretation of the Genesis tradition until the time of Milton.
- Fontette, Micheline Pontenay de. Les religieuses à l'âge classique du droit canon: Recherches sur les structures juridique des branches féminines des ordres (Bibliothèque de la Société d'histoire ecclésiastique de la France) Paris: J. Vrin, 1967.
- Gillmann, F. "Weiblicher Kleriker nach dem Urteil der Frühscholastik," Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht, XCIII (1913), 239-253.
- Healy, Emma Thérèse. Women According to St. Bonaventura. Erie, Pa.: Villa Maria College, 1956.
- McLaughlin, Eleanor. "'Christ my Mother': Feminine Naming and Metaphor in Medieval Spirituality." Paper read at the conference of Anglican Theologians, Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, Ill. April 2-5, 1975.
An excellent paper that widens the sense of what sorts of language are appropriate to use about God, and shows us that to determine the tradition of the church you have to pay more attention to worship and not exclusively concentrate on what the theologians have been saying.
- Maes, D. H. "Le femme et le Sacerdoce d'après Gabriel Vasquez," Studia Moralia, X (1973), 279-346.
- Raming, Ida. Der Ausschluss der Frau vom Priesterlichen Amt. Gottgewollte Tradition oder Diskriminierung? Eine rechtshistorisch-dogmatische Untersuchung der Grundlagen von Kanon 968 Section 1 des Codex juris canonici. Köln: Bohlau-Verlag, 1973.
I have not seen this work; it is supposed to be a masterpiece of

historical investigation. It comes to the conclusion that the canon in question is based on a false biology and misapprehension of the tradition.

Reynolds, Roger E. "Virgines Subintroductae in Celtic Christianity," Harvard Theological Review, LXI (1968), 547.

Go and read it; if you have stumbled through to this point in the thesis you need a laugh.

Schafer, K. H. Die Kanonissenstifter in deutschen Mittelalter. Stuttgart: Enke, 1907.

Werner, Ernst. "Zur Frauenfrage und zum Frauenkult im Mittelalter: Robert V. Arbissel und Fontevrault," Forschungen und fort-schritte, XXIX (1958), 269ff.

I. The Twentieth Century Conflict over the Priesthood of Women in England and America

Acres, Louise. Women and the Priesthood. Naperville, Ill.:Allenson, 1931.

Ady, C. M. The Role of Women in the Church. Church Assembly Press and Publications Department, 1948.

Armstrong, George B. "The Impossibility of Ordaining Women," American Church News, XXXVII:1 (Lent, 1972).
The extreme conservative Anglo-Catholic position.

Bardsley, C. C. B., ed. Women and Church Work. London: Longmans, Green, 1917.

Barnhouse, Ruth Tiffany. "An Examination of the Ordination of Women to the Priesthood in Terms of the Symbolism of the Eucharist," Anglican Theological Review, LVI (1974), 279-291.

An examination of the implications of the ordination of women for the symbolic power and effectiveness of Eucharist based on the discoveries of modern psychology, especially the Jungian school.

Barrett, Ellen. "Priesthood and Humanity, A Reply to Fr. Holmes," Anglican Theological Review, Supplementary Series 2 (September 1973), 78-83.

Beeck, Frans Josef van. "Invalid or Merely Irregular?--Comments by a Reluctant Witness," Journal of Ecumenical Studies, XI:3 (1974), 381-400.

A Roman's carefully reasoned opinions on the Philadelphia ordinations. They are valid, but not regular.

- Bishop, Bernadine. "The Future of the Female," The Future of Catholic Christianity. Ed. Michael de la Bedoyere. Constable, 1966.
- Bruce, E. M. and G. E. Duffield, eds. Why Not? Priesthood and the Ministry of Women. Abingdon-Berks, 1972.
A statement of the negative case by many different authors and from many different angles.
- Capon, Robert Farrer. "The Ordination of Women: A Non-Book," Anglican Theological Review, Supplementary Series 2 (September 1973), 68-78.
An excellent paper supporting the priesthood for women. It relies on traditional theological understandings of the theology of orders.
- Coppens, J. "Le ministère des femmes dans l'Église, Une controverse dans l'Église Anglicane," La Femme Belge, III (1920), 135ff.
There were three consecutive articles exploring the arguments used in the first spate of discussion in the Anglican church. This discussion erupted around the end of World War I.
- Fisher, David H. "Symbol, Myth and Ritual: After Philadelphia," The Saint Luke's Journal of Theology, XVIII:4 (1975), 286-298.
- Flacton, Sue. Why Not Ordain Women? London: Church Union, 1971.
- Fletcher, Joseph. William Temple, 20th Century Christian. New York: Seabury Press, 1963.
See p. 112, and 276; note 152.
Temple was theologically in favor of the ordination of women but felt it a threat to the ecumenical movement.
- Grey, B. "Women Priests Now? Report on the Episcopal General Convention," Christianity and Crisis, XXXIII:13 (1973), 148-152.
- Henson, H. Hensley. Bishoprick Papers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Hewitt, Emily and Suzanne Hiatt. Women Priests: Yes or No? New York: Seabury Press, 1973.
Good on the psychological and political aspects of the problem in the Episcopal church. Intended as an introduction for intelligent lay people and priests.
- Hilder, G. F. "Women and Ministry," Theology (December 1954), 452-456.
A reply to the articles in Theology by Sherwin Bailey and Margaret Thrall. Sees man as "head" of wife, and calls for distinct but complementary ministries.
- Hoak, N. 'A Command of the Lord': The Theological Implications of of Women in the Priesthood. London: Church Literature Association, 1974.

Hodgson, L. "Theological Objections to the Ordination of Women," Expository Times, LXXVII:2.7 (1966), 210-213.

Hodgson is strongly in favor of ordaining women. "To say that a woman is incapable of receiving priestly ordination involves saying that her sexual differentiation carries with it a deficiency in spiritual receptivity and power." He refutes the arguments that women cannot receive the indelible character of priesthood, that the priest represents a masculine Christ, and that Jesus' choosing of only male apostles is binding.

Holmes, Urban T. "The Feminine Priestly Symbol and the Meaning of God." A special presentation for the Conference on Religion and the Human Sciences, The College of Preachers, December 1, 1973.

This article discusses the priest as symbolic man and the opportunities and changes the ordination of women would bring about in the symbol structures of our Christian lives.

_____. "Priesthood and Sexuality: A Caveat only Dimly Perceived," Anglican Theological Review, LV:1 (1973), 62-67.

Ellen Barrett's article is a reply to this. Holmes works out the meaning of priesting women in terms of psychological archetypes and points to some dim, unformed but great changes in the ways we perceive God.

Howard, Robert Wilmot. Should Women Be Priests? Three Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford. Oxford: Blackwell, 1949.

Howard was strongly in favor of women priests.

King, J. A. "The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood: Some Current Roman Catholic Attitudes," Theology, LXXVIII:657 (1975), 142-147.

Urges consultation with Rome and agreement before action is taken by the Church of England.

Kirk, K. E. Beauty and Bands and Other Papers, ed. E. W. Kemp. Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1957.

See pp. 177-188. Kirk was against the ordination of women.

Lace, O. Jessie. The Ordination of Women to the Historic Ministry of the Church. London: 10 Clarence Gate Gardens, 1958.

Lampe, G. W. H. "Church Tradition and the Ordination of Women," Expository Times, LXXVI (1964-65), 123-125.

Lampe says that there is no tradition against the ordination of women that is binding with any honest understanding of the word tradition. The response by J. Pretlove on p. 294 completely misses Lampe's point.

_____. "Women and Holy Orders," Modern Churchman, X (1967), 226-230.

Lewis, C. S. "Priestesses in the Church?" in Walter Hooper (ed.) God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.

See pp. 234-239. Claims that there is a divine revelation of the

nature of God bound up with the exclusively masculine priesthood. Neglects to tell us what this might be. He appeals to the irrational and opaque in God's revelation to us as reasons for keeping the priesthood male. Neglects to distinguish between his and the church's 'irrationality' in having only male priests, and any of the other follies and stupidities the human race is involved in.

Lutge, H. Karl, ed. Sexuality-Theology-Priesthood. San Gabriel, Ca.: Concerned Fellow Episcopalians, n.d.

MacKenzie, K. D. Women and the Liturgical Ministry. London: Mowbrays, 1943.

Mascall, Eric. "The Ministry of Women," Theology, LVII (1954), 428-29. Mascall has been very vocal against the ordination of women. See the correspondence in Theology, LVIII (1955), 101-103. His main argument is that the word became male and performed its priestly work as a male in Jesus. He tries to ground the distinct roles of men and women in the church in the prototypes of Mary and Jesus.

_____. Women Priests. London: Church Literary Association, 1972.

Medsger, Betty. "The Episcopal Ordinations: Where Have All the Liberal Bishops Gone?" Christianity and Crisis, XXXV:13 (1975), 188-192.

Noice, Elizabeth. "Priesthood and Women: A Lay View," Anglican Theological Review, LV:1 (1973), 53-61.

A sort of grab-bag article that refutes the common arguments against the priesting of women and goes on to argue in favor of it so that the priesthood can represent a full or complete humanity.

Northcott, Cecil. "Women Priests in England?" Christian Century (January 24, 1968), 101-102. Slight.

Page, Robert J. "Chicago and Philadelphia: Moral and Theological Refutations," The Saint Luke's Journal of Theology, XVIII:4 (1975), 299-309.

Patton, Frank Jr. "Women's Ordinations: Should Church Disputes Go Civil?" Christianity and Crisis, XXXV:15 (1975), 214-217.

Phillimore, Sir Robert. The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England. 2 Vols. London: Stevens & Sons, 1873.

See Vol. I, p. 115, where I Corinthians 14:34 and I Timothy 2:12-14 are recognized as excluding women from ordination. Also Vol. II, p. 1911 where women can be sextons because the office was not public and did not involve the "care and inspection of the morals of the parishoners."

Picton-Turberville, E. Should Women Be Priests and Ministers? London: Society for the Equal Ministry of Men and Women in the Church, 1954.

This work was first published in 1917, a rather early date to dis-

cover people actively working for the priestly ordination of women. B. H. Streeter helped to write this article.

Quickwood (Lord). The Ministry of Women in Statutory Services. London: S.P.C.K., 1951.

Raven, C. C. Women and Holy Orders. London: 1928.

Raven was one of the pioneers in the careful examination of this question. Most people now have forgotten that he was asking the important questions about the ordination of women before most Episcopalians were born. The church has had plenty of time to think.

_____. Women and the Ministry. New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1929.

A powerful personal statement by Raven about actual injustices to deaconesses in the practice of the Church of England. He talks about the evolution of the church and its consequent readiness for women as priests as one area of growth in our understanding of the gospel.

Richardson, Cyril. "Women in the Ministry," Christianity and Crisis, XI:21 (1951), 166-167.

Rogers, T. Guy. "The Ministry of Women: Past, Present and Future," Expository Times, XLIII (1932), 171-176.

Roxburgh, Margaret. Women's Work in the Church of England. 1958.

Royden, A. Maude. "The Ministry of Women in the Church," Expository Times, L (1939), 346-349.

Rutler, George William. Priest and Priestess. Ambler, Pa.: Trinity Press, 1973.

Rutler is a fire and brimstone anti. Not too careful in his scholarship, he tends to exaggerate and sometimes the last half of a quote is left out.

Ryrie, Charles Caldwell. The Place of Women in the Church. New York: Macmillan, 1958.

Smythe, P. R. The Ordination of Women. London: Skeffington, 1939.

Again, notice the date. This question has been in theologians' minds much longer than most people imagine.

Sparrow-Simpson, W. J. The Place of Women in the Church. London: B. Scott, 1917.

Streeter, B. H. and Edith Picton-Turberville. Women and the Church. London: Fisher & Unwin, 1917.

Temple, F. S., ed. Some Lambeth Letters. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

See pp. 74-75 and 100-101. Two letters on the subject of women priests that Temple wrote while Archbishop of Canterbury.

Thrall, M. E. "The Ministry of Women," Theology, LVIII (1955), 26.

_____. "The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood," Theology, LVII (1954), 330-335.

A general examination of Biblical evidence from the point of view of the Anglican churches.

Trott, Frances. Our Call. Wayne, N.J.: Sheba Press, 1973.

A series of personal statements by women in the Episcopal Church who were deacons or seminarians seeking the priesthood. An excellent way to get into some of the human feelings and variables in the question.

Underhill, Evelyn. "The Ideals of the Ministry of Women." Mixed Pasture, London: Methuen, 1933.

This paper was originally read at a conference called for the Central Council for Women's Church Work, October 1932. Underhill is against women priests: it breaks with Catholic tradition, and the decision would require a united decision by Christendom. Opts for the creation of complementary ministries.

Urban, Linwood. "A Dialogue Concerning the Ordination of Women." A paper presented at the Conference of Anglican Theologians, Evanston, Ill., Seabury-Western Seminary, April 2-5, 1975.

An excellent discussion of the logical requirements for a valid argument against the ordination of women on the basis of tradition. It is first class.

Williams, N. P. "Deaconesses and Holy Orders," in E. W. Kemp (ed.) N. P. Williams. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.

See pp. 185-201. Williams is firmly against the priesting of women.

Wright, J. Robert. "Documentation and Reflection: An Address in Favor of the Ordination of Women to the Priesthood," American Theological Review, LV:1 (1973), 68-73.

_____. "Editorial," Plumblin: A Journal of Ministry in Higher Education. (August, 1974).

It is interesting to note both the time of the first publications on the ordination of women and the number of prominent Anglican theologians who have published in favor of it: Streeter, famous for his work on the source criticism of the gospels; Raven for his work on the relation between theology and natural science; Lampe for his historical studies of life in the early church. Even Temple, in a very exposed position, politically, found no reasons against it other than inconvenience and unfavorable historical circumstances that could conceivably change.

J. The History of Deaconesses in the Anglican Communion

Bellardi, Werner. Fünfig Jahr Zehlendorfer Verband für Evangelische Diakonie. Berlin: Christlicher Zeitschriftenverlag, 1966.

Davidson, Randall Thomas. Life of A. C. Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury. New York: Macmillan, 1891.

This biography is close to a eulogy and quite non-critical. See pp. 448-473, Vol. 2 for the period in Tait's life when he "set aside" the first deaconesses.

Golder, C. History of the Deaconess Movement in the Christian Church. Cincinnati: Jennings and Pye, 1903.

Ludlow, J. M. Woman's Work in the Church. London: 1866.

Written to promote the work of deaconesses in the Anglican churches.

Muhlenberg, W. A. Two Letters on Protestant Sisterhoods. New York: P. Hair and Co., n.d.

Panton, Ethel and Dorothy Batho, eds. Order of Deaconesses, Past and Present. Student, 1937.

Potter, Henry Codman. Sisterhoods and Deaconesses. New York: Dutton, 1873.

Robinson, Cecilia. The Ministry of Deaconesses. London: Methuen, 1898.

Appendix on deaconesses in the early church, lists the canons dealing with them. Examines the historical evidence and outlines fully the rise of the modern movement giving a good list of sources. An excellent starting point for research.

Williams, Thomas. Priscilla Lydia Sellon. London: S.P.C.K., 1965.
A full length biography of the first modern Anglican deaconess.

"Deaconess" in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 9th ed. American Supplement, III. New York: Allen, 1889.

Gives the names of the important American deaconess centers and a detailed discussion of the revival of the office in the Lutheran and Anglican churches.

"Deaconess" in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 13th ed. (1926), VII.
A summary of the history of the order in the ancient church.

K. Official Publications and Reports

1. Anglican Church

Annotated Constitutions and Canons for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. New York: Seabury Press, 1954.

See pages 257-267. This gives the historical background of the struggle for deaconesses and therefore dates the General Convention minutes that contain proceedings on this topic. See the following Journals of General Convention: 1871, 1874, 1877, 1880, 1883, 1889. The main mover was Huntingdon.

Deaconesses in the Church of England, a statement approved by the Diocesan Bishops in England, 1946.

"The Form and Manner of Making Deaconesses." Printed in Acts of the Convocations of Canterbury and York. London: S.P.C.K., 1961. The original act was passed in 1924.

The Ministry of Women, report of a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. London: S.P.C.K., 1919.

The Committee was appointed in 1917 as a result of the earliest attempts to create a female ministry. The report is negative, not caring to venture a reason for the restriction, but at the same time claiming to be authoritative. The report is done with the usual Anglican thoroughness in things historical.

The Ministry of Women, report of the Archbishop's Commission, 1935. London: Church Assembly Press and Publications Board, 1935.

Partners in Mission, report of the 1973 Anglican Consultative Commission meeting at Dublin. London: S.P.C.K., 1973.

"Progress Report to the House of Bishops from the Committee to Study the Proper Place of Women in the Ministry of the Church, Oct. 1966." Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., 1967. Appendix 35.4-35.12.

Report of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury on the Ministry of Lay Women, No. 685. 1956.

"Report to the Joint Commission on Ordained and Licensed Ministries." Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., 1970, pp. 532-539.

Note that the church has been officially considering this question since 1919.

Women and Holy Orders, Report of the Archbishops' Commission on. London:

Church Information Office, 1966.

This report was requested in 1962, and consists of a catalog of all the differing shades of opinion available. It has separate sections on biblical and historical, psychological, and ecumenical considerations, and several statements of the various considerations for and against.

Women and the Ministry, a Report of the Doctrinal Commission of the Church in Wales, 1972. Cardiff: A. McLay and Co., 1972.

This is the positive report of the investigations of doctrine connected with the ordaining of women. One member dissented, five were in favor of ordaining women.

Women in Ministry: A Study. Report of the Working Party set up jointly by the Ministry Committee of the Advisory Council for the Churches Ministry and the Council for Women's Ministry in the Church. Westminster: Church House, Church Information Office, 1968.

This booklet does not consider the priesthood of women but is the latest up-to-date survey of all other forms of the ministry in which they officially engage.

Women's Work in the Church, report of a Committee appointed by the Archbishops in 1942. Church Assembly, 1943.

2. Church of Scotland

The Place of Women in the Church, a Study Document. Edinburgh, 1959.

Reports of the Committee on the Order of Deaconesses, 1958, 1959, 1960. Edinburgh.

Supplementary Report (1964) of the Panel on Doctrine of the General Assembly, on the Place of Women in the Church.

3. Lutheran Church

The Ordination of Women. A Report Distributed by Authorization of the Church Body Presidents as a Contribution to Further Study Based on Materials Produced Through the Division of Theological Studies of the Lutheran Council, U.S.A. Condensed by Raymond Tie-meyer, n.p. Augsburg, 1970.

Vollversammlung des Lutherischen Weltbundes: Studien Dokument für Sektion VI--Frauen der Kirche. Hannover, 1952.

4. Roman Catholic

"On Deacons" Constitution De Ecclesia, Second Vatican Council.

Women in the Church: A Statement by the Worship and Mission Section of the Roman Catholic/Presbyterian Reformed Consultation, Richmond, Virginia, Oct. 30, 1971.

The Romans state that they will not ordain women for some time but that the Presbyterians ought to try it out so that they (the Roman Catholics) can see how it works.

5. Other Churches

Concerning the Ordination of Women; World Council of Churches Report of Faith and Order. Geneva: 1964.

LaDiaconesse. (World Council of Churches Studies, No. 4) Geneva: 1967.

What Is Ordination Coming To? Consultation on the Ordination of Women, Cartigny, Switzerland, 1970. Ed. Brigalitz Bam. Geneva: World Council of Churches, Dep't. on the Co-operation of Men and Women in the Church, Home and Society, 1971.

L. The Debate in the Church of Sweden
And Among Mainline Protestant Churches

Daniélou, Jean. "L'Ordination des femmes en Suède," Études, CCCV (1960), 398-99.

Althouse, La Vonne. "Ordain Women," American Lutheran. A series of articles on woman's position in the church. (January, 1966), pp. 10-12, 21-22; (February 1966), pp. 6-8; (May 1966), pp. 6-9; (July 1966), p. 10; (November 1966), p. 10.

Baurbeck, Christine. "Women as Clergymen in Germany," The Lutheran Quarterly, XVIII (1966), 168-172.

Bertinetti, Ilse. Frauen im Geistlichen Amt: Die theologische Problem-
atück evangelisch-lutherischen Sicht. Berlin: Evangelische
Verlagsanstalt, 1965.

Brand, Paul. "Notes sur le problème de l'accès de la femme au ministère
pastoral," Verbum Caro, LXXVIII (1966), 47-66.

Uses symbolic anthropology to challenge the possibility of women as formal liturgical ministers. Written from a French Reformed standpoint.

Brunner, Peter. "The Ministry and the Ministry of Women," Lutheran World, VI (1959), 247-274.

Brunner denies the possibility of priesthood for women. Examines at length the position of various Reformation figures, especially Luther. He also examines the biblical and historical background, but makes some very odd statements, like one that Paul's forbidding of women to speak is running against the practice of his own time. See Anna Paulsen's reply: VII (1960), 231ff.

Gartner, Bertil. "Das Amt, der Mann und die Frau." In Signo Crucis. Uppsala, 1963.

Havel, J. E. "La question du pastoral féminin en Suède," Archives de sociologie des religions, IV (1959), 116-130.

A historical survey of the development of the debate in Sweden; includes a section on the various arguments and who used them.

Hertzsch, E. "Das Problem der Ordination der Frau in der evangelischen Kirche," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXI (1956), 379f.

Kaster, E. "Une femme pasteur," Études Théologique et religieuses, XL (1965), 109-112.

A personal narrative by one of the women pastors of the French Reformed tradition.

Ollgaard, Hans. "Women as Clergymen in Denmark," Lutheran Quarterly, XVIII (1966), 163-167.

A summary of the history of the question in Denmark and a report of the present state of women in the pastorate there.

Parvey, Constance F. "Women in the Ordained Clergy: Entering on Historically Male Order," Lutheran World, XXII:1 (1975), 32f.

Paulsen, Anna. Die Vikarin, Der Dienst der Frau in den Amtern der Kirche. Band I. Gelnhausen und Berlin: Burkhardtthaus-Verlag, 1956.

Prenter, Reginald. Die Ordination der Frauen zu den überlieferten Pfarrämtern der Lutherischen Kirche. Berlin-Hamburg: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1967.

Refohle, F.-R. "Le problème des 'femmes-prêtres' en Suède," Lumière et vie, VIII (1959), 80.

Reumann, John. "What in Scripture Speaks to the Ordination of Women?" Concordia Theological Monthly, XLIV (1973), 5-30.

Rhode, Sten. "The Controversy over the Ordination of Women in Sweden," Lutheran World, IV (1958), 392-404.

An excellent historical summary of the development of the controversy in Sweden.

Schroeder, Edward H. "The Orders of Creation--Some Reflections on the History and Place of the Term in Systematic Theology," Concordia Theological Monthly, XLIII:3 (1972), 165-178.

A very useful article which attempts to show that most arguments against the ordination of women based on the supposed orders of creation do not understand the Reformation's use of that doctrine. Attacks its relevancy to the question of the ordination of women, except as perhaps justifying their ordination.

Tamm-Gotlind, M. "Women Ministers in the Swedish Church," Modern Churchman, VI:3 (1963), 213-215.

Personal reactions of women ordained in the Swedish Church to the situations they find themselves in. Almost a propaganda piece for the ordination of women, but at the same time an interesting glimpse into the women's minds. Tamm-Gotlind was one of the strong supporters of the original measure in Sweden.

Wahlstrom, Eric H. "Ordination of Women in the Church of Sweden?" Lutheran Quarterly, X (1958), 161-164.

Zahringer, P. Damsus. "Die Frau am Altar und auf der Kanzel," Erbe und Auftrag, XXXVI (1960), 304-315.

M. The Debate in the Roman Catholic Church

Albericone, James. Woman: Her Influence and Zeal as an Aid to the Priesthood. Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1964.

Allen, W. F. "Women Priests--Improbable," Pastoral Life, XXII:8 (1973), 40-48.

Bennet, Owen. "Women: A Christian Sign," Homiletical and Pastoral Review, LXXVI:2 (1975), 29-32, 52-54.

Bodson, J. "La femme et le sacerdoce," Vie Consacrée, V (1972), 342-67. Explores the symbolic aspect of women in theology.

Bourrioud, Sister Marie Claire. "Le Sacerdoce ministériel--Doit il etre Reservé aux hommes?" Vie Consacrée, V (1972), 298-309.

Bouyer, Louis. Woman and Man with God. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1960.

Brothers, J. "Les femmes et les fonctions ecclésiastiques," in Iersel and Roland Murphy (eds.) Office and Ministry in the Church (Concilium No. 80) New York: Herder & Herder, 1972.

Bruns, J. Edgar. God As Woman, Woman As God. New York: Paulist Press, 1973.

- Butler, Sister S. "Ministry and Ministries. What About the Sisters?" IDOC International. North American Edition (Nov. 1971), 13-23.
- Caddeo, . "Le 'Disconesse!!" Recherche Biblique e Religiose, (Milan) VII:2-3 (1972), 211-225.
- Carroll, Elizabeth B. S. M. "Women and Ministry," Theological Studies, XXXVI:4 (1975), 660-687.
- Casalis, George. "L'Homme et la femme dans le ministère de l'Eglise No. 2," Études théologiques et religieuses. Montpellier XXXVIII (1963), 27-46.
- Chenderlin, F. D. "Women as Ordained Priests?" Homiletical and Pastoral Review, LXXII:8 (1972), 25-32.
- _____. "Woman Priests. More Thoughts But No Second Thoughts," Homiletical and Pastoral Review, LXXII:8 (1973), 13-23.
- Congar, Y. M.-J. "La femme dans l'Eglise," Recherches de Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, XXXVII (1953), 763ff.
- Cunningham, Agnes. "Women Priests," Priest, Sept. 19, 1971.
- Dolly, Sarah B., ed. Women's Liberation and the Church: The New Demand for Freedom in the Life of the Christian Church. IDOC North American, Associated Press, 1970.
- Evans, G. R. "Ordination of Women," Homelitical and Pastoral Review, LXXXIII:1 (1972), 29-32.
- Eyden, Rene van. "La femme et les fonctions liturgiques," in Herman Schmidt (ed.) Liturgy: Self-Expression of the Church. (Concilium No. 72) New York: Herder & Herder, 1972.
- Ford, Joan Massyngberd. "The Ordination of Women," Continuum No. 5, (1967), Supplement, 738-743.
- Funk, P. Josef. "Klerikale Frauen?" Osterreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht, XIV:4 (1963).
- Gorres, I. F. "Über die Weihe von Frauen zu Priesterinnen," Die Christliche Sonntag, XVII (1965).
Takes the position that only a man can represent Christ.
- _____. "Women as Priests?" Herder Correspondence, III:7 (1966), 205-207, 210-211.
A firm negative statement.
- Gössmann, Elizabeth. "Women as Priests?" in Hans Küng (ed.) Apostolic Succession: Rethinking a Barrier to Unity. (Concilium No. 34) New York: Paulist Press, 1968.

Hudson, E. R. "Women in the Office of Deacon, Report of the Catholic Theological Society of America," Clergy Review, V:66 (1971), 891-893.

This is a study report of the society prepared for the U.S. Bishop's Committee on the permanent diaconate.

Hünemann, Peter. "Conclusions Regarding the Female Diaconate," Theological Studies, XXXVI:2 (1975), 325-333.

Kubeck, John C. "The Church, Woman and the Priesthood," Homelitical and Pastoral Review, LXXV:5 (1975), 56-61.

Lauer, Rosemary. "Women and the Church," Commonweal, LXXIX:13 (1963), 365-368.

Lefevre, Ch. "Sur le problème du presbyterat féminin. La rencontre louvaniste des 20 et 21 décembre 1971," Revue theologique Louvain, III (1972), 178-200.

O'Collins, G. "An Argument for Women Priests," America, CXXIX:5 (1973), 122-123.
Slight.

Parvey, Connie. "Ordain Her--Ordain Her Not . . ." Dialog, VIII:3 (1969), 203-208.

Peters, Jan. "Is there Room for Women in the Functions of the Church?" in Hans Küng (ed.) Apostolic Succession: Rethinking a Barrier to Unity. (Concilium No. 34) New York: Paulist Press, 1968.

_____. "Is there a Place for Women in the Functions of the Church?" Ascent (1972), 73-81.

Phillips, G. "La femme dans L'Église." Ephemerides theologique louvanienses, XXXIX (1961), 597-603.

Sheets, J. R. "Ordination of Women: The Issues," American Ecclesiastical Review, CLXIX:1 (1975), 17-36.

A negative statement; masculinity signifies effectiveness in bringing about union, femininity attractiveness. Therefore only men are to be priests. He fails to prove the key question, is masculinity actually more effective in bringing about union than femininity?

"Consecration and Ministry of Women," Way, Supplement 17 (Autumn 1972), 69-112.

This issue contains the following articles:

Welter, Immolata. "Mary Ward's Apostolic Vision," pp. 69-91.

Beyer, Jean. "Current Questions," pp. 92-98.

Isusi, Begona de. "Personal Reflections," pp. 99-106.

Byrne, Leo C. and George Bernard Flahiff. "Syndol Observations," pp. 107-112.

"Wir Schweigen nicht Langer!" Zürich: 1964.

This is a series of essays written by Roman Catholic women supporting the priesthood for women, and other reforms. Unfortunately, I have not been able to obtain a copy. It is a very seminal piece of work if the number of times writers on the continent refer to it means anything.

N. The Debate in the Orthodox Church

Barrios, George. "Women and Priestly Office According to the Scripture," Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, XIX:3 (1975), 174-192.

Eudokimov, Paul. La femme et le salut du monde: étude d'anthropologie chrétienne sur les chrismes de la femme. Tournai-Paris: Casterman, 1958.

Hopko, Thomas. "On the Male Character of Christian Priesthood," St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, XIX:3 (1975), 147-173.

Schmemmann, Alexander. "Concerning Women's Ordination," St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, XVII (1973), 239-243.

Timiades, Metropolitan. "From the Margin to the Forefront," The Ecumenical Review, XXVII:4 (1975), 366-373.

O. Miscellaneous Articles

Bacon, Francis D. Women in the Church. London: Lutterworth, 1946.

Barillier, R. "Sur le ministère pastoral féminin." Revue Réformée (1971), 85-104.

Barot, Madeleine. "Les femmes et le ministère," La Communauté des disséminés, No. 9 (July 1960), 20-29.

Blocher-Saillens, Me. A. Librees pour Christ. Paris: Le Bons Semeurs, 1961.

Dumas, André. "Similitude et Diversité des Sexes dans le plan de Dieu," Études Théologiques Religieuses, XL:2 (1965), 97-108.

Emery, Pierre-Yves. "Féminité de l'église et féminité dans l'église," Études Théologiques et Religieuses, XL:2 (1965), 90-96.

Ermath, Margaret Sittler. Adam's Fractured Rib: Observations on Women in the Church. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.

Eyden, R. J. A. van. "Die Frau im Kirchenamt," Wort und Wahrheit, XIII (1967), 250-62.

- Floris, Ennio. "Le femme et le ministère pastoral." Christianisme Social, IX (1964), 535-553.
- Frost, J. and L. Morrison. "On the Ordination of Women," Christianity and Crisis, V:32 (1972), 49-52.
- Gaha, C. "Social Factors in Regard to the Ordination of Women: an African View," Ghana Bulletin of Theology, (June 1971), 35-41.
- Gallay, P. Des femmes-prêtres? Paris: Bords, 1973.
- Gibson, Elsie. When the Minister is a Woman. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- Henderson, R. W. "Reflections on the Ordination of Women," Study Encounter, VII (1971), 1-6.
- Hudson, E. R. "Women and the Diaconate," Clergy Review, LXVI (1971), 886-889.
- Jans, P.-J. "Mann und Frau in ihren Verhältnis zum Kirchlichen Amt," Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift, LII (1962), 145-156.
- Kirschbaum, Charlotte von. Decouverte de la femme. Geneve: C. P. E., 1951.
Translated to German: Die Wirkliche Frau. Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1949.
- Kroger, A. C. "Die Stellung der Frau in der christlichen Kirche," Concordia Theological Monthly, IV (1933), 85-95.
Wishes to prohibit all teaching whatever to women, fundamentalist exegesis. Note the date.
- Magistra, L. "The Ministry of Women," Theology, LXIII (1960), 281-85.
There was a correspondence war in Theology over the ministry of women. See LXIII, 377f, 472f, 787f.
- McKenna, Mary L. Women of the Church: Role and Renewal. New York: Kennedy, 1967.
Mainly an historical examination, using entirely secondary sources.
- McNalley, A. "Pamela Becomes a Shepherd," Sign (July-August 1972), 9-16.
- Metzke, Erwin. "Anthropologie der Geschlechter," Theologische Rundschau (Tübingen) XXII:3 (1954), 211-41.
- Prohl, Russel C. Women in the Church, a Restudy of Woman's Place in Building the Kingdom. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.
- Rondet, H. "Elements pour une théologie de la femme," Nouvelle revue theologique, LXXIX (1957), 915-940.

- Roper, Anita. "Weibliches Priestertum?" Orientierung, XXXI (1967).
- Reuther, Rosemary. "Male Clericalism and the Dread of Women," Ecumenist, XI:5 (1973), 65-69.
- Scaer, D. P. "The Office of Pastor and the Problem of Ordination of Women Pastors," Springfielder, XXXVIII:2 (1974), 123-133.
- _____. "May Women be Ordained as Pastors?" Springfielder, XXXVI:2 (1972), 89-109.
- Sommemans, J. "Vers l'ordination des femmes?" Spiritus, XXIX:V (1966).
- Stamm, Raymond T. "The Status of Women Workers in the Church," Lutheran Quarterly, X (1958), 139-60.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Women in the Church: No Special Pleading," Soundings, LIII:4 (1970), 374-378.
- D'Ursel, Odette. "Women's Accession to the Pastoral Ministry in the Churches Stemming from the Reformation," Lumen Vitae, XXIX:4 (1974), 554-582.
- A very useful article covering the whole sweep of the movement toward the ordination of women in the non-Catholic and non-Orthodox churches. Lists important church events and important publications.
- Westphal, Charles. "La femme et le ministère pastoral de l'église," Foi et Vie (Nov.-Dec. 1949), 473-486.
- Wijk, C. M. van Asch van. Zweisam ist der Mensch. München: Kaiser, 1952.

Women in Theological Education.

Theme for the summer 1972 issue of Theological Education. The whole issue is on women in theological education.

P. Ecumenical Concerns

- Swidler, A. "Ecumenical Questions: The Status of Women," Journal of Ecumenical Studies, IV (1967), 113-115.
- "Ecumenism and Women Episcopal Priests," Journal of Ecumenical Studies, IX (1972), 229-241.
- This article consists of three documents: the address of the Rt. Rev. Kilmer Myers to the 122nd convention of the Diocese of California. 2. The reply of the Rev. William Wolf to the above. 3. The report of the World and Mission section of the Roman Catholic/Presbyterian and Reformed Consultation.
- "Ordination: A Questionable Goal for Women," Ecumenist, II (1973), 81-82.

"Women in the Church," Ecumenical Trends, I (1972)

Statement by the worship and Mission section of the Roman Catholic/
Presbyterian Reformed consultation.

"Theological Reflection on the Ordination of Women," Journal of Ecumeni-
cal Studies, X (1973), 695-699.

Report prepared by the Committee on Pastoral Research and Practices.